NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DXCII.

MARCH, 1906.

OUR NAVY.

BY AN AMERICAN CITIZEN.

I.

If the question were asked, "What branch of the public service holds the highest place in the esteem of the American people, and comes nearest to exciting its admiration, not to say its affection?" the answer might well be: "The United States Navy." There are many reasons for this. Apart from its importance in commercial development and national defence, the profession of the sailor has always had a tinge of heroism, which leads every maritime people to give it a high place in their esteem. Our naval history is singularly free from incidents calculated to diminish this natural esteem. Beginning with the exploits of the daring sea-captain about whom every child reads in the history of the Revolution, it was shown in the War of 1812 that our insignificant Navy was not below that of the greatest and best organized navy of Europe in the skill of its captains, the quality of its ships, and the valor of its sailors. In modern times, it has met every test with such success that no foreign critic is found to deny its equality, so far as individual efficiency of men, ships and guns is concerned, with the navy of any other Power. The history of its operations during the Civil War,

Copyright, 1906, by The North American Review Publishing Company All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as well as during the recent war with Spain, has been one of almost unbroken success. Our naval service has also been imbued with a high sense of loyalty to the constituted authorities of the country, seen not only in that formal obedience which is prescribed by the regulations, but in a sentiment of reverence for the authority of the President, acting through the Secretary of the Navy as his representative. In the record of performance of public duty by individual officers we seldom find a case of recreance to a public trust, so frequent in the administration of the civil departments of our Government. The naval service has also commended itself to the better class of our public men by its freedom from that rather ill-defined evil which we call "politics." This means that, as an organization, it has not countenanced its officers in efforts to promote their individual interests at the expense of the service at large, and that the practice of seeking the influence of eminent public men to secure assignments to naval duty is discountenanced by the Navy as a body.

In addition to possessing these qualities, the Navy has been actuated by an *esprit de corps* which leads every officer to strive, not only to make the service what, from the point of view of the organization, it should be, but to conceal from the public gaze those shortcomings and failures which must, in the nature of things, be part of long-continued experience in every branch of human endeavor. Associated with this is tact in keeping within reach of the public eye, in a quite gentle and unobtrusive way, every commendable incident of the service. In the use of its official machinery to afford pleasing little services to seafaring men, our Navy Department is remarkably liberal.

An example of the spirit of the service is also seen in the broad interest taken by its leading officers in everything tending to promote its successful administration. Under our system, the head of the Navy Department is necessarily a civilian, responsible for a service which requires more extended and minute technical knowledge in its details than does any other Department of the Government. The interest taken by leading officers in enabling their civilian head to make the wisest use of his power is shown by the attempts which have been made from time to time to provide him, by legal enactment, with the best and most authoritative professional advice. We believe that there has scarcely been an administration since the Civil War in which projects

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to establish a Board for this purpose have not been urged upon the President, the Secretary of the Navy, Congress, or in the public press.

The natural result of these conditions has been a feeling on the part of the public, and of its representatives at the seat of government, that we have in the Navy an organization which can be left to regulate its interior organization for itself, and to control its own relation to the public. Unheard outside of their own sphere,—no agency is more powerful in determining our naval policy than the individual opinions of naval officers.

The high place in public estimation, the grounds of which we have set forth, has its drawbacks. We have forgotten that no set of men, however disinterested, should be allowed to determine their own relations to the country and to its authorities. If the motto "No friends in business" is sound in the operations of a mercantile house, it is still sounder in the administration of public affairs. We have been forgetting that, after all, a naval officer is human and subject to all the frailties of our common nature. The swing of a pendulum, which, the farther it is drawn in one direction, will, when left to itself, swing the farther in the other, is typical of human tendencies. An unbroken record of admirable performance leads to a high place in public estimation. This leads the public to allow the makers of the record to proceed in their own way, in the exercise of a power which they would not otherwise have been allowed to wield. Irresponsible power is sure to be abused sooner or later. The longer it is permitted, the more completely does it result in making the real or supposed interests of those who exercise it their supreme law. How wide may be the swing of the pendulum in the passage from the Navy of history to the Navy of the future has suddenly been made clear to us by events of startling import at the Naval Academy. These events have a special claim on the attention of the public, because they show, as nothing ever before did, our Navy of the future in the making. If we look carefully into the facts associated with hazing, as brought out by the investigation of the naval authorities, we shall see that they are not to be treated as mere examples of the exuberance of youth, or of those occasional infractions of discipline which are sure to occur in every military service. Although the reports in the daily press, which alone have yet seen the light, are incomplete in details, a very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

little reading between the lines will bring out features worthy of serious consideration.

The first feature to be noticed is that the newly assembled class of cadet midshipmen does not take its first lesson in conduct from official regulations, or from anything said or done by its responsible official superiors, but from the classes immediately above it in the Academy. If a newly appointed cadet has any consciousness of the principle that there is a higher embodiment of the law than a first-classman, it has not been made evident. The spirit which the cadet imbibes from his first day's residence is not that of respect for the civil authorities, but of loyalty to the customs and traditions of the service which he is entering.

A second feature is the immediate and complete diffusion of the spirit thus imbibed through the entire body. It seems almost incredible that, in a class of two or three hundred well-bred and spirited young men, nearly all of good family, newly mustered into an honorable service the guiding rules of which are obedience to law and dignity of personal conduct, there should not be found one with the manly self-respect to refuse going through the silly antics and submitting to the personal indignities imposed upon the fourth-classmen by their seniors. Yet, notwithstanding that all must have been fully conscious that the imposition of these indignities was expressly prohibited by a law of Congress, no exception has come to light in the course of the investigation. Were the sufferers under any impression that submission was their official duty, we could only admire the amenity to discipline which would then be implied. But they could not possibly have labored under this delusion.

A third suggestive feature of the hazing which appears at the Academy is that it is not, as in the colleges, felt to be beneath the dignity of a student above the grade of sophomore. So far as the facts have been brought out, the leaders in the practice were of the higher classes of the Naval Academy—men who, about to graduate, were face to face with the serious duties and responsibilities of their profession. This fact naturally suggests the question: At what grade in the service does the growing officer feel obedience to law to be, not only his personal duty, but a virtue to be enforced through the service generally?

Painful light is thrown on this question by the fact that the machinery for enforcing good conduct at the Academy is un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equalled by that of any similar institution elsewhere. Not only is there a large body of staff-officers and civilian subordinates charged with duties which bring them into constant contact with the midshipmen, and require them to report cases of disorder, but there are also no less than sixty officers of the line attached to the Naval Academy, whose duty it is to preserve order, and report every case of infraction of discipline. To suppose that it was out of the power of these guardians of the peace to know what was going on would imply a mental blindness quite incompatible with efficiency in their profession. We can see in their negligence only a spirit of disregard for law, propagating itself as new classes enter, and extending up into the service no one knows to how high a grade. The conclusion that the junior officers, at least, well remembered and fully sympathized with the customs of the midshipmen is hard to avoid.

Our judgment of the case is likely to be blinded by the fact that it is scarcely possible to find any case in human affairs in which the extremes of good and evil are so closely blended, and in which qualities fitted to excite the highest admiration are either productive of or associated with the worst results. From one point of view, the spectacle of three hundred respectable young men, ready to stand on their heads, swallow nauseous or injurious substances, and go through undignified contortions, at the order of a superior, affords a fine example of amenability to discipline. But this should only increase our regret that such qualities should be directed toward an end injurious to, if not destructive of, all the higher traits in human nature. That personal independence, and with it personal initiative, must be largely crushed out by the process goes without saying. We can hardly conceive that the tyranny thus exhibited will not, in a different form, dominate the whole future of the officer, whatever grade he may reach. The prospect is that, unless drastic measures are speedily taken by Congress and by the head of the Navy Department, the United States Navy of the future will grow into one in which interior customs shall supplant law and regulations, the real interests of the country be sacrificed to the supposed interests of the service, and every form of chicanery used to prevent the supremacy of law.

The method of dealing with the Navy which we have pointed out has resulted not only in giving law and discipline the sec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ond place in the rules of the service, but in a number of features in which our Navy is not all that it should be. The fact is that our Navy is distinguished from that of Great Britain, and perhaps that of nearly every country, by the complete elimination from it, so far as possible, of the civilian element. While the idea that no civilian can possibly know enough of any subject of naval importance to make his advice of value in any question of naval administration is not avowed, it seems to be an unwritten principle of the service. In the administration of the British navy there are, immediately under the Admiralty, some fifteen or twenty departments, closely corresponding in the nature of their functions to the bureaus and offices of our Navy Department. The majority of these are under civilian directors. The chief constructor of the British navy now is and long has been a civilian, holding no naval commission, but enjoying a position high enough in the world of science to be a Fellow of the Royal Society. The Director of studies at the Royal Naval College at Greenwich is a civilian. In fact, almost the only exceptions to civilian chiefs are found in the departments concerned with the purely technical operations of the navy, which especially require military training. Moreover, when any question, even of a technical character, arises in the service, civilians are invited to aid in its decision whenever they are conversant with the subject to which it relates. In a word, the navy not only belongs to the country, but is of the country; the whole country is interested in it, not only as a body, but in all its operations, and is ready to take part in promoting them in every way it can.

The case is certainly very different in our own service. We should not like to say that, among the Boards which the Navy Department is continually appointing to consider and report upon the widest range of matters affecting the service, no case of a civilian assignment has ever been found. But we do conceive that it would take some searching on the part of any one not actually acquainted with the organization of these Boards to find any recent case of the kind. Closely associated with this is the importance of the place taken by "shore duty" in the life of our line officers. Great, indeed, is the contrast between ourselves and England in this respect. Sea service alone counts in the record of a British officer of the lower grades; with us, sea and shore duty count equally under the law. No critical observer can fail

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be impressed with the number of officers engaged in Washington and Annapolis in duty that could be as well performed by civilians.

The interior characteristics of our naval service which have grown up through the causes we have set forth may be summed up. Two of them may be said to determine our entire policy in naval organization. They are:—the complete merging of the individual in the corps, and the unification of spirit and function in the corps itself, resulting in the whole acting as a unit in its relations to the public. It would be difficult to find another organization in which the rules of professional ethics are more strictly obeyed; in fact, as we have already shown, it is largely due to these rules that the service holds so high a place in our estimation. Many fields of naval duty are extremely attractive, while others are the reverse. But an officer is not allowed to employ the ordinary methods, so common in other fields, to secure the one kind of duty and to avoid the other. He may freely state his wishes, and his reasons for them, assured that the case will be decided on its merits and not by influence. Every officer is expected to maintain at all times the general ability of his fellows to perform any duty which the Department may assign them. If he entertains any modest distrust of his own powers, that distrust must be confined to himself, and not be shared by the service generally. Thus rotation in office and rotation of functions is the rule of the service, so far, at least, as the line is concerned. To uphold the policy of permanence in any field of duty would imply that the officer who had gained experience in the field was better qualified for it than his fellows,—a quite inadmissible claim. This idea has been allowed to rule so completely as to blind the service, and the public which relies upon it for its views of naval affairs, to one of the urgent requirements of naval warfare as developed during the last twenty years. We mean the specialization of functions, which is more necessary now than it ever was before. A layman setting forth his independent view of the situation cannot but be gratified to find himself supported by so eminent an authority as Admiral Luce, who, in the January number of this REVIEW, has pointed out the necessity of a corps of marine engineers. But so much remains to be said that we shall invite the reader to take a comprehensive view of the situation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

Studying a war-ship of the twentieth century we see that the functions necessary to her efficiency are three in number, separated by broad lines of demarcation. We have, first, the sailor properly so called whose function it is to command, care for, and navigate the ship. The qualities most essential to his success must be based on natural endowments. He must be born with the power of command, the faculty of ready adaptation of means to ends, a sentiment of admiration for the powers at play upon a raging ocean, a keen appreciation of the infinitely varying effects of wind and water on his ship, and a mastery of her behavior in a seaway under all conditions. Coupled with a natural as well as an acquired capacity for understanding the action of all these forces must be a professional training in the art of manœuvring ships, and bringing them into action, separately or in company. His position in the service must carry with it a supremacy corresponding to that of his functions as a commander. It is around his personality that the associations of the country at large with the Navy will necessarily cluster. Among the heroic qualities required in him, physical courage need not be counted, because it may be taken for granted; but stress must be laid on that nerve which will not permit the sense of danger to hold any place in his mind at the moment of an emergency, when he must be able to use his faculties with the same coolness and sound judgment as under ordinary circumstances. Reason teaches him that, under all conditions, even when his ship is going down, the safest course for all concerned is that which rests upon the most cool and careful judgment; and he must always be able to follow the dictates of reason.

His qualifications are those most difficult to determine in advance. Proficiency in scientific studies at the Naval Academy affords a fairly satisfactory test of the ability of the engineer and the constructor, but it does not necessarily mark the successful manager of a ship in a storm, or the leader of a fleet in battle. It would be an equal mistake to suppose that an aggressive personality is a quality especially to be sought for. Men do not readily outgrow the juvenile idea which gives rise to a sense of incongruity in the mind of every bright schoolboy when he first learns that military officers are forbidden, under severe penalties, to prove their courage by accepting a challenge to a duel.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Associated with this idea is the very plausible impression that readiness and efficiency in personal encounters with an opponent have their value in a course of training for military command. But our experience in the Civil War showed that coolness and heroism are more likely to be associated with a modest and unassuming demeanor than with the largest measure of seeming dash, energy and combativeness. Our future leader on the ocean may have more of the manner of a spectacled professor of classic lore than of a sea-going hero. On the other hand, while the successful naval leader may well be an excellent student, his qualities are not likely to be associated with a taste for being absorbed in the intricacies of mathematical investigation.

Next, we have the engineer, whose function it is to regulate the forces which, though confined to a small space on board ship, would, if let loose, rend her to atoms in a moment. The command of these forces requires a profound knowledge of those branches of mathematical physics which treat of the power and properties of steam. A mathematical head and a taste for machinery are here of greater moment than heroic qualities.

The third element, completing the equipment of the ship, comprises the engines of destruction with which an enemy is to be assailed. Modern progress has reduced this department of marine warfare to a science quite distinct from that of managing or propelling the ship. The high explosives of our time exert forces whose study forms a distinct department from that of the forces of steam. Only certain elementary conceptions are common to the two. This fighting and destroying department is concerned not only with guns and ammunition, but with the torpedo and the submarine. All that we know of the laws of progress leads us to believe that the latter agencies will, in the future, be our main reliance for the defence of our coasts in the event of a foreign war. Their study, no less than that of the gun, involves a separate application of science, which can best be pursued by men devoted to it. It is to be regretted that, when public attention has been called to this requirement by fatal accidents in connection with the armament of a war-ship, no better policy has been proposed to meet the case than that of encouraging officers to "specialize in ordnance." That the necessity should be recognized is something; that such a policy as that suggested should be deemed sufficient only illustrates the necessity of looking

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to other sources than the profession for the initiation of measures adequate to its future necessities.

From the point of view we have taken, it seems quite clear that the three specialties which must come into play in the naval warfare of the future are as distinct from each other as specialties of men cooperating on board ship well can be. All human experience shows that the highest professional efficiency in any field can be reached only by men devoting the main energies of their lives to its attainment. It seems to us quite plain that the efficiency of the future Navy must depend upon the recognition of this great fact, and the devising of a system of naval education and organization to meet it. The writer does not deny that the idea of this radical movement seems not yet to have found a place in our own Navy, though it has in that of some foreign Powers. It is, therefore, incumbent upon us to examine the reasons which have been urged for a less radical view.

Beginning, as before, with the line officer, the current view which has dominated naval instruction may be put into this form:—In former times, ships were propelled by the power of wind acting on the sails. The main qualities required in a naval commander were a quick and correct apprehension of the action of this motive power, and readiness in devising methods of applying it in storm and calm, in ordinary navigation and in action. Now all this is changed. Steam has taken the place of sails, and the commanding officer of the future must be proficient in the science of steam-engineering, even as his predecessor was in the action of wind on the sails. He must, therefore, combine the art of engine-driving with that of navigating the ship.

We maintain that this argument is based on a too wide and general view of the case, to the exclusion of the particular facts. It drops out of sight special points of difference between sail and steam power, which put an altogether different face on the situation. In the age of the sailing-ship, her successful management depended on the numberless ways in which sails could be set and exposed to the wind, and on the readiness of the commander in deciding what should be done with the sails under all conditions of wind, water and surroundings. Standing on the quarter-deck, he had the motive power always in sight, and his function was to understand and direct it.

Instead of sails which could be reefed, set and furled in in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

finite ways, we now have propellers which can do nothing but go fast or slow, and take turns with each other in going fast or slow, backward or forward. Their line of action cannot be changed. Everything they can do is directed by a few signals. The agencies which make them go fast or slow, as well as the propelling machinery, are out of sight of the commanding officer. His function is, therefore, only that of directing a set of men concealed from sight in the interior of the ship. If these men understand their duties, there is not the slightest necessity that he should be master of their professional details. A general acquaintance with the power of steam, its mode of action, and the way in which the motion of the engines affects the ship is all that he requires. No ground can, therefore, be found for making an engineer out of the commanding officer, or his subordinate concerned with caring for and managing the ship.

We enforce this view by a claim for which we invite the fullest measure of professional criticism. If a great naval leader of former times, a Drake or a Nelson, who had never seen a steamship, or a Farragut, who had never seen a modern battle-ship, had to lead a fleet of battle-ships of the twentieth century into action, one day spent in learning about the way ships are propelled, signals communicated to the engineers, and guns handled, would qualify him for the great task of fighting a modern naval battle. We have a practical lesson in this direction, in the naval policy of the Oriental nation which has so rapidly become great by casting off the shackles of tradition, and attacking the problems which confronted it from the standpoint of common sense. It was seen by the Japanese authorities that strategic insight, correctness and rapidity of judgment, tireless energy, and intimate acquaintance with the human nature of the sailors he was to imbue with his own spirit, were the traits to be looked for in the commander of a fleet. These secured, the subject of steam-enginery was left to the staff. How much the alert victor in the Sea of Japan may have known or forgotten about the theory of the steam-engine we cannot say; our point is that no such knowledge was a factor in determining his place in the service.

Talk as we may about the war-ship of the future as an enormous engine, and the work of fighting her as one of operating her machinery, we cannot do away with the great fact that the ocean on which she floats remains what it always was, and will de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mand the same qualities as always in the man who navigates it. So long as storms lash it, so long must the spirit which led the first man to launch his bark on its waters, and the qualities which enabled the first sailor to brave its storms, remain the essentials of successful sea navigation and sea fighting. Our traditional conception of the sailor can be altered only by the addition of new qualities, not by the subtraction of those already there.

The general conclusion to which this review of the situation leads is that, if the American Navy is to deserve and command our good opinion in the future, as it has in the past, we must radically change our policy in dealing with it, not only as to details of organization, but as to general spirit. We must recognize the peculiar influences to which its members are subject from the first day they enter the service, and mould our policy accordingly. Instead of inferring that a body of men so carefully educated in their line must be well fitted for any public function having the remotest relation to their field of activity, we should consider whether it is not a general trait of human nature that, when a man is trained from youth to the highest efficiency in a special field, and taught to devote all his faculties to a single end, he is thereby unfitted for activities outside his field. If the view here enforced is correct, the projects which are always on foot for extending the functions of the Navy should be abandoned and this important agency used only for its proper purpose;—much as we use an exquisitely designed machine only for the work to which it has been adapted.

We have set forth the evidence that there is no profession in which the qualities essential to efficiency may so readily become sources of evil as in that of a naval officer. If this be true, there is no department of the Government in which the representatives of the nation should more judiciously and carefully discriminate between conclusions based on wide knowledge and long professional experience, on the one hand, and the professional bias of a body of men having the enlarged scope of their field of activity always in view on the other. We have shown why it is that we cannot look to the service itself to initiate and carry through any measure of reform which would diminish its influence. Careful inquiry might well disclose the urgencies of more than one measure which the service itself will never initiate until a new spirit pervades it.

AN AMERICAN CITIZEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOSTON.

BY HENRY JAMES.

It sometimes uncomfortably happens for a writer, consulting his remembrance, that he remembers too much and finds himself knowing his subject too well, which is but the case of the bottle too full for the wine to start. There has to be room for the air to circulate between one's impressions, between the parts of one's knowledge, since it is the air, or call it the intervals on the sea of one's ignorance, of one's indifference, that sets these floating fragments into motion. This is more or less what I feel in presence of the invitation—even the invitation written on the very face of the place itself, of its actual aspects and appearances —to note one's "impression" of Boston. Can one *have,* in the conditions, an impression of Boston, any that has not been for long years as inappreciable as a "sunk" picture?—that dead state of surface which requires a fresh application of varnish. The situation I speak of is the consciousness of "old" knowledge, knowledge so compacted by the years as to be unable, like the bottled wine, to flow. The answer to such questions as these, no doubt, however, is the practical one of trying a shake of the bottle or a brushful of the varnish. My "sunk" sense of Boston found itself vigorously varnished by mere renewal of vision at the end of long years; though I confess that under this favoring influence I ask myself why I should have had, after all, the notion of overlaid deposits of experience. The experience had anciently been small—so far as smallness may be imputed to any of our prime initiations; yet it had left consequences out of proportion to its limited seeming self. Early contacts had been brief and few, and the slight bridge had long ago collapsed; wherefore the impressed condition that acquired again, on the spot, an intensity, struck me as but half explained by the inordinate power

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of assimilation of the imaginative young. I should have had, none the less, to content myself with this evidence of the magic of past sensibilities, had not the question suddenly been lighted for me as by a sudden flicker of the torch—and for my special benefit—carried in the hand of history. This light, waving for an instant over the scene, gave me the measure of my relation to it both as to immense little extent and to quite subjective character.

I.

It was in strictness only a matter of noting the harshness of change—since I scarce know what else to call it—on the part of the approaches to a particular spot I had wished to revisit. I made out, after a little, the entrance to Ashburton Place; but I missed, on that spacious summit of Beacon Hill, more than I can say, the pleasant little complexity of the other time marked with its share of the famous Old-World "crookedness" of Boston, that element of the mildly tortuous which did duty, for the story-seeker, as an ancient and romantic note and was half envied, half derided, by the merely rectangular criticism. Didn't one remember the day when New-Yorkers, when Philadelphians, when pilgrims from the West, sated with their eternal equidistances, with the quadrilateral scheme of life, "raved" about Cornhill, and appeared to find in the rear of the State House a recall of one of the topographical, the architectural jumbles of Europe or Asia? And did not, indeed, the small happy accidents of the disappearing Boston exhale in a comparatively sensible manner the warm breath of history, the history of something as against the history of nothing?—so that, being gone, or generally going, they enabled one at last to feel, and almost to talk, about them as one had found one's self feeling and talking about the sacrificed relics of Old Paris and Old London. In this immediate neighborhood of the enlarged State House, where a great raw clearance has been made, memory met that pang of loss, knew itself sufficiently bereft to see the vanished objects, a scant but adequate cluster of "nooks," of such odds and ends as parochial schemes of improvement sweep away, positively overgrown, within one's own spirit, by a wealth of legend. There was at least the gain, at any rate, that one was now going to be free to picture them, to embroider them, at one's ease—to tangle them up in retrospect and make the real romantic claim for them. This,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accordingly, is what I am doing; but I am doing it in particular for the sacrificed end of Ashburton Place, the Ashburton Place that I anciently knew. This eminently respectable by-way, on my return to question it, opened its short vista for me honestly enough, though looking rather exposed and undermined, since the mouth of the passage to the west, formerly measured and narrow, had begun to yawn into space—a space peopled, in fact, for the eye of appreciation, with the horrific glazed perpendiculars of the future. But the pair of ancient houses I was in quest of kept their tryst; a pleasant individual pair, mated with nothing else in the street, yet looking, at that hour, as if their old still faces had lengthened, their shuttered, lidded eyes had closed, their brick complexions had paled, above the good granite basements, to a fainter red—all as with the cold consciousness of a possible doom.

That possibility, on the spot, was not present to me, occupied as I was with reading into one of them a short page of history that I had my own reasons for finding of supreme interest, the history of two years of far-away youth spent there at a period—the closing-time of the War—full both of public and of intimate vibrations. The two years had been those of a young man's, a very young man's, earliest fond confidence in a "literary career," and the effort of actual attention was to recover on the spot some echo of ghostly footsteps—the sound as of taps on the window-pane heard in the dim dawn. The place itself was, meanwhile, at all events, a conscious memento, with old secrets to keep and old stories to witness for, a saturation of life as closed together and preserved in it as the scent lingering in a folded pocket-handkerchief. But when, a month later, I returned again (a justly rebuked mistake) to see if another whiff of the fragrance were not to be caught, I found but a gaping void, the brutal effacement, at a stroke, of every related object, of the whole precious past. Both the houses had been levelled and the space to the corner cleared; hammer and pick-axe had evidently begun to swing on the very morrow of my previous visit—which had, moreover, been precisely the imminent doom announced, without my understanding it, in the poor scared faces. I had been present, by the oddest hazard, at the very last moments of the victim in whom I was most interested; the act of obliteration had been breathlessly swift, and if I had often seen how fast history could be made I had doubtless never so felt that it could be unmade still faster.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was as if the bottom had fallen out of one's own biography, and one plunged backward, into space, without meeting anything. That, however, seemed just to give me, as I have hinted, the whole figure of my connection with everything about, a connection that had been sharp, in spite of brevity, and then had broken short off. Thus it was the sense of the rupture, more than of anything else, that I was, and for a still much briefer time, to carry with me. It seemed to leave me with my early impression of the place on my hands, inapt, as might be, for use; so that I could only try, rather vainly, to fit it to present conditions, among which it tended to shrink and stray.

It was on two or three such loitering occasions, wondering and invoking pauses that had, a little vaguely and helplessly perhaps, the changed crest of Beacon Hill for their field—it was at certain of these moments of charged yet rather chilled contemplation that I felt my small cluster of early associations shrivel to a scarce discernible point. I recall a Sunday afternoon, in particular, when I hung about on the now vaster platform of the State House for a near view of the military monuments erected there, the statues of Generals Hooker and Devens, and for the charm at once and the pang of feeling the whole backward vista, with all its features, fall, from that eminence, into gray perspective. The top of Beacon Hill quite rakes, with a but slightly shifting range, the old more definite Boston; for there seemed no item, nor any number, of that remarkable sum that it wouldn't anciently have helped one to distinguish or divine. There all these things essentially were at the moment I speak of, but only again as something ghostly and dim, something overlaid and smothered by the mere modern thickness. I lingered half an hour, much of the new disposition of the elements here involved being duly impressive, and the old uplifted front of the State House, surely, in its spare and austere, its ruled and pencilled, kind, a thing of beauty, more delightful and harmonious even than I had remembered it; one of the inestimable values again, in the eye of the town, for taste and temperance, as the perfectly felicitous "Park Street" Church, hard by, was another. The irresistible spell, however, I think, was something sharper yet—the coercion, positively, of feeling one's case, the case of one's deeper discomfiture, completely made out. The day itself, toward the winter's end, was all benignant, like the immense ma-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jority of the days of the American year, and there went forward across the top of the hill a continuous passage of men and women, in couples and talkative companies, who struck me as laboring wage-earners, of the simpler sort, arrayed in their Sunday best and decently enjoying their leisure. They came up from over the Common, they passed or paused, exchanging remarks on the beauty of the scene, but presenting themselves to me as of more interest, for the moment, than anything it contained.

For no sound of English, in a single instance, escaped their lips; the greater number spoke a rude form of Italian, the others some outland dialect unknown to me—though I waited and waited to catch an echo of antique refrains. No note of any shade of American speech struck my ear, save in so far as the sounds in question represent to-day so much of the substance of that idiom. The types and faces bore them out; the people before me were gross aliens to a man, and they were in serene and triumphant possession. Nothing, as I say, could have been more effective for figuring the hitherward bars of a grating through which I might make out, far off in space, "my" small homogeneous Boston of the more interesting time. It was not, of course, that our gross little aliens were immediate "social" figures in the narrower sense of the term, or that any personal commerce of which there might be question could color itself, to its detriment, from their presence; but simply that they expressed, as everywhere and always, the great cost at which every place on my list had become braver and louder, and that they gave the measure of the distance by which the general movement was *away*—away, always and everywhere, from the old presumptions and conceivabilities. Boston, the bigger, braver, louder Boston, was "away," and it was quite, at that hour, as if each figure in my procession were there on purpose to leave me no doubt of it. Therefore, had I the vision, as filling the sky, no longer of the great Puritan "whip," the whip for the conscience and the nerves of the local legend, but that of a huge applied sponge, a sponge saturated with the foreign mixture and passed over almost everything I remembered and might still have recovered. The detail of this obliteration would take me too far, but I had even then (on a previous day as well as only half an hour before), caught at something that might stand for a vivid symbol of the general effect of it. To come up from School

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Street into Beacon was to approach the Anthenæum—exquisite institution, to fond memory, joy of the aspiring prime; yet to approach the Athenæum only to find all disposition to enter it drop as dead as if from quick poison, what did *that* denote but the dreadful chill of change, and of the change, in especial, that was most completely dreadful? For had not this honored haunt of all the most civilized—library, gallery, temple of culture, the place that was to Boston at large as Boston at large was to the rest of New England—had it not with peculiar intensity had a "value," the most charming of its kind, no doubt, in all the huge country, and had not this value now, evidently, been brought so low that one shrank in delicacy from putting it to the test? It was a case of the detestable "tall building" again, and of its instant destruction of quality in everything it overtowers. Put completely out of countenance by the mere masses of brute ugliness beside it, the temple of culture looked only rueful and snubbed, hopelessly down in the world; so that, far from being moved to hover or to penetrate, one's instinct was to pass by on the other side, averting one's head from an humiliation one could do nothing to make less. And this, indeed, though one would have liked to do something; the brute masses above the comparatively small refined façade (one saw how happy one had always thought it) having for the inner ear the voice of a pair of school-bullies who hustle and pummel some studious little boy. "'Exquisite' was what they called you, eh? We'll teach you then, little sneak, to be exquisite! We allow none of that rot round here." It was heart-breaking, this presentation of a Boston practically void of an Athenæum; though perhaps not without interest as showing how much one's own sense of the small city of the earlier time had been dependent on that institution. I found it of no use, at any rate, to think, for a compensatory sign of the new order, of the present Public Library; the present Public Library, however remarkable in its pomp and circumstance, and of which I had at that hour received my severe impression, being neither exquisite nor on the way to become so—a difficult, an impassable way, no doubt, for public libraries. Nor did I cast about, in fact, very earnestly, for consolation—so much more was I held by the vision of the closed order which shaped itself, continually, in the light of the differing present; an order gaining an interest for this backward view precisely as one felt that all the parts and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tokens of it, while it lasted, had hung intimately together. Missing those parts and tokens, or as many of them as one could, became thus a constant slightly painful joy: it made them fall so into their place as items of the old character, or proofs, positively, as one might say, of the old distinction. It was impossible not to see Park Street itself, for instance—while I kept looking at the matter from my more "swagger" hilltop—as violently vulgarized; and it was incontestable that, whatever might be said, there had anciently not been, on the whole continent, taking everything together, an equal animated space more exempt from vulgarity. There had probably been comparable spaces—impressions, in New York, in Philadelphia, in Baltimore, almost as good; but only almost, by reason of their lacking (which was just the point) the indefinable perfection of Park Street.

It seems odd to have to borrow from the French the right word in this association—or would seem so, rather, had it been less often indicated that that people have better names than our's even for the qualities we are apt to suppose ourselves more in possession of than they. Park Street, in any case, had been magnificently *honnête*—the very type and model, for a pleasant street-view, of the character. The aspects that might elsewhere have competed were *honnêtes* and weak, whereas Park Street was *honnête* and strong—strong as founded on *all* the moral, material, social solidities, instead of some of them only; which made again all the difference. Personal names, as notes of that large emanation, need scarcely be invoked—they might even have a weakening effect; the force of the statement was in its collective, cumulative look, as if each member of the row, from the church at the Tremont Street angle to the amplest, squarest, most purple presence at the Beacon Street corner (where it always had a little the air of a sturdy proprietor with back to the fire, legs apart and thumbs in the armholes of an expanse of high-colored plush waistcoat), was but a syllable in the word "Respectable" several times repeated. One had somehow never heard it uttered with so convincing an emphasis. But the shops, up and down, are making all this as if it had never been, pleasant "premises" as they have themselves acquired; and it was to strike me from city to city, I fear, that the American shop in general pleads but meagrely—whether on its outer face or by any more intimate art—for indulgence to its tendency to swarm, to bristle, to vo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciferate. The shop front, observed at random, produced on me from the first, and almost everywhere alike, a singular, a sinister impression, which left me uneasy till I had found a name for it; the sense of an economic law of which one had not for years known the unholy rigor, the vision of "protected" production and of commodities requiring certainly, in many cases, every advantage Protection would give them. They looked to me always, these exhibitions, consciously and defiantly protected—insolently safe, able to be with impunity anything they would; and when once that lurid light had settled on them I could see them, I confess, in none other; so that the objects composing them fell, throughout, into a vicious and villainous category, quite as if audibly saying: "Oh come; don't look among us for what you won't, for what you sha'n't, find, the best quality attainable; but only for that quite other matter, the best value we allow you. You must take us or go without, and, if you feel your nose thus held to the grindstone by the hard fiscal hand, it's no more than you deserve for harboring treasonable thoughts."

So it was, therefore, that while the imagination and the memory strayed—strayed away to other fiscal climates, where the fruits of competition so engagingly ripen and flush—the streets affected one at moments as a prolonged show-case for every arrayed vessel of humiliation. The fact that several classes of the protected products appeared to consist of articles that one might really anywhere have preferred, did little, oddly enough, to diminish the sense of severe discipline awaiting the restored absentee on contact with these occasions of traffic. The discipline, indeed, is general, proceeding as it does from so many sources, but it earns its name, in particular, from the predicament of the ingenuous inquirer who asks himself if he can "really bear" the combination of such general manners and such general prices, of such general prices and such general manners. He has a helpless bewildered moment during which he wonders if he mightn't bear the prices a little better if he were a little better addressed, or bear the usual form of address a little better if the prices were in themselves, given the commodity offered, a little less humiliating to the purchaser. Neither of these elements of his dilemma strikes him as likely to abate—the general cost of the things to drop, or the general grimness of the person he deals with over the counter to soften; so that he reaches out again for balm

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to where he has had to seek it under other wounds, falls back on the cultivation of patience and regret, on large international comparison. He is confronted too often, to his sense, with the question of what may be "borne"; but what does he see about him if not a vast social order in which the parties to certain relations are all the while marvellously, inscrutably, desperately "bearing" each other? He may wonder how, under the strain, social cohesion does not altogether give way; but that is another question. For he asks himself quite as much as anything else how the shop-man or the shop-lady can bear to be barked at in the manner he constantly hears used to them by customers—he recognizes that no agreeable form of intercourse *could* survive a day in such air; so that what is the only relation finding ground there but a necessary vicious circle of gross mutual endurance?

These reflections connect themselves, moreover, with that most general of his restless hauntings in the United States—not only with the lapse of all wonderment at the immense number of absentees unrestored and making their lives as they may in other countries, but with the preliminary American postulate or basis for any successful accommodation of life. This basis is that of active pecuniary gain and of active pecuniary gain only—that of one's making the conditions so triumphantly pay that the prices, the manners, the other inconveniences, take their place as a friction it is comparatively easy to salve, wounds directly treatable with the wash of gold. What prevails, what sets the tune, is the American scale of gain, more magnificent than any other, and the fact that the whole assumption, the whole theory of life, is that of the individual's participation in it, that of his being more or less punctually and more or less effectually "squared." To make so much money that you won't, that you don't "mind," don't mind anything—that is absolutely, I think, the main American formula. Thus your making no money—or so little that it passes there for none—and being thereby distinctly reduced to minding, amounts to your being reduced to the knowledge that America is no place for you. To mind as one minds, for instance, in Europe, under provocation or occasion offered, and yet to have to live under the effect of American pressure, is speedily to perceive that the knot can be untied but by a definite pull of one or the other string. The immense majority of people pull, luckily for the existing order, the string that consecrates their connection

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with it; the minority (small, however, only in comparison) pull the string that loosens that connection. The existing order is meanwhile safe, inasmuch as the faculty of making money is in America the commonest of all and fairly runs the streets: so simple a matter does it appear there, among vast populations, to make betimes enough *not* to mind. Yet the withdrawal of the considerable group of the pecuniarily disqualified seems no less, for the present, an assured movement; there will always be scattered individuals condemned to mind on a scale beyond any scale of making. The relation of this modest body to the country of their birth, which asks so much, on the whole—so many surrenders and compromises and the possession, above all, of such a prodigious head for figures—before it begins, in its wonderful way, to give, or to "pay," would appear to us supremely touching, I think, as a case of communion baffled and blighted, if we had time to work it out. It would bathe in something of a tragic light the vivid truth that the "great countries" are all, more and more, happy lands (so far as any can be called such) for any, for every, sort of person rather than the middle sort. The upper sort—in the scale of wealth, the only scale now—can to their hearts' content build their own castles and move by their own motors; the lower sort, masters of gain in *their* degree, can profit, also to their hearts' content, by the enormous extension of those material facilities which may be gregariously enjoyed; they are able to rush about, as never under the sun before, in promiscuous packs and hustled herds, while to the act of so rushing about all felicity and prosperity appear for them to have been comfortably reduced. The frustrated American, as I have hinted at him, scraping for *his* poor practical solution in the depleted silver-mine of history, is the American who "makes" too little for the castle and yet, "minds" too much for the hustled herd, who can neither achieve such detachment nor surrender to such society, and who most of all accordingly, in the native order, fails of a working basis. The salve, the pecuniary salve, in Europe, is sensibly less, but less on the other hand also the excoriation that makes it necessary, whether from above or below.

II.

Let me at all events say for the Park Street Church, while I may still, on my hilltop, keep more or less in line with it, that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this edifice persistently "holds the note," as yet, the note of the old felicity, and remains by so doing a precious public servant. Strange enough, doubtless, to find one's self pleading sanctity for a theological structure sanctified only by such a name—as who should say the Park Street Hotel or the Park Street Post-office; so much clearer would the claim seem to come were it the case of another St. Clement Danes, or of another St. Mary-le-Strand. But in America we get our sanctity as we can, and we plead it, if we are wise, wherever the conditions suffer the faintest show of color for it to flush through. Again and again it is a question, on behalf of the memorial object (and especially when preservation is at stake), of an interest and an appeal proceeding exactly from the conditions, and thereby not of an absolute, but of a relative force and weight; which is exactly the state of the matter with the Park Street Church. This happy landmark is, in strictness, with its mild recall, by its spire, of Wren's bold London examples, the comparatively thin echo of a far-away song—playing its part, however, for harmonious effect, as perfectly as possible. It is admirably placed, quite peculiarly *present,* in the Boston scene, and thus, for one reason and another, it points its moral as not even the State House does. So we see afresh, under its admonition, that charm is a flower of wild and wind-blown seed—often not to be counted on when most anxiously planted, but taking its own time and its own place both for enriching and for mocking us. It mocks assuredly, above all, our money and our impatience, elements addressed to buying or "ordering" it, and only asks that when it does come we shall know it and love it. When we fail of this intelligence, it simply, for its vengeance, boycotts us—makes us as vulgar folk who have no concern with it. Then if we ever miss it we can never get it back—though our deepest depth of punishment, of course, is to go on fatuously not missing it, the joy of ourselves and of each other and the derision of those who know. These reflections were virtually suggested to me, on the eve of my leaving Boston, by ten words addressed to my dismay; the effect of which was to make Park Street Church, for the hour, the most interesting mass of brick and mortar and (if I may risk the supposition) timber in America.

The words had been spoken, in the bright July air, by a friend encountered in the very presence of the mild monument, on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

freshly perceived value of which, for its position, for its civil function, I had happened irrepressibly to exclaim. Thus I learned that its existence might be spoken of as gravely menaced—menaced by a scheme for the erection of a "business block," a huge square of innumerable tiers and floors, thousands of places of trade, the trade that in such a position couldn't fail to be roaring. In the eye of financial envy the church was but a cumberer of the ground, and where, about us, had we seen financial envy fail when it had once really applied the push of its fat shoulder? Drunk as it was with power, what was to be thought of as resisting it? This was a question, truly, to frighten answers away—until I presently felt the most pertinent of all return as if on tiptoe. The perfect force of the case *as* a case, as an example, *that* was the answer of answers; the quite ideal pitch of the opportunity for virtue. Ideal opportunities are rare, and this occasion for not sacrificing the high ornament and cynosure of the town to the impudence of private greed just happens to be one, and to have the finest marks of character. One had but to imagine a civilized community reading these marks, feeling that character, and then consciously and cynically falling below its admirable chance, to take in the impossibility of any such blot on the page of honor, any such keen appetite for the base alternative. It would be verily the end—the end of the old distinguished life, of the common intelligence that had flowered formerly, for attesting fame, from so strong a sap and into so thick and rich a cluster. One had thought of these things as one came and went—so interesting to-day in Boston are such informal consultations of the oracle (that of the very air and "tone"), such puttings to it of the question of what the old New England spirit may have still, intellectually, æsthetically, or for that matter even morally, to give; of what may yet remain, for productive scraping, of the formula of the native Puritanism educated, the formula once capacious enough for the "literary constellation" of the Age of Emerson. Is that cornucopia empty, or does some handful of strong, or at least sound, fruit lurk to this day, a trifle congested by keeping, up in the point of the horn? What, if so, are, in the ambient air, the symptoms of this impossibility? What, are the signs of intellectual promise, poetic, prosaic, philosophic, in the current generations, those actually learning their principal lesson, as one assumes, from the great University

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hard by? The old formula, that of Puritanism educated, has it, in fine, except for "business," anything more to communicate? Or do we perhaps mistake the case in still speaking, by reason of the projected shadow of Harvard, of "education" as at all involved?

Oh, for business, for a commercial, an organizing energy of the first order, the indications would seem to abound, the air being full of them, as of one loud voice, and nowhere so full perhaps as at that Park Street corner, precisely, where it was to be suggested to me that their meaning was capable, on occasion, of turning to the sinister. Commercial energy, at least, was educated, up to the eyes—Harvard was still caring for that more than for anything else—but the wonderments, or perhaps rather the positive impressions, I have glanced at bore me constant company, keeping the last word, all emphasis of answer, back as if for the creation of a dramatic suspense. I liked the suspense, none the less, for what it had in common with "intellectual curiosity," and it gave me a light, moreover, which was highly convenient, helping me to look at everything in some related state to this proposition of the value of the Puritan residuum—the question of whether value *is* expressed, for instance, by the little tales, mostly by ladies, and about and for children romping through the ruins of the Language, in the monthly magazines. Some of my perceptions of relation might seem forced, for other minds, but it sufficed me that they were straight and clear for myself—straight and clear again, for example, when (always on my hilltop and raking the prospect over for memories) I quite assented to the tacit intimation that a long æsthetic period had closed with the disappearance of the old Museum Theatre. This had been the theatre of the "great" period—so far as such a description may fit an establishment that never produced during that term a play either by a Bostonian or by any other American; or it had at least, with however unequal steps, kept the great period company, made the Boston of those years quite complacently participate in its genial continuity. This character of its *being* an institution, its really being a theatre, with a repertory and a family of congruous players, not one of them the baleful actor-manager, head and front of all the so rank and so acclaimed vulgarities of our own day—this nature in it of not being the mere empty shell, the indifferent cave of the winds, that yields

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a few nights' lodging, under stress, to the passing caravan, gave it a dignity of which I seemed to see the ancient city gratefully conscious, fond and jealous, and the thought of which invites me to fling over it now perhaps too free a fold of the mantle of romance. And yet why too free? is what I ask myself as I remember that the Museum had for long years a repertory—the repertory of its age—a company and a cohesion, theatrical trifles of the cultivation of which no present temple of the drama from end to end of the country appears to show a symptom. Therefore I spare a sigh to its memory, and, though I doubtless scarce think of it as the haunt of Emerson, of Hawthorne, or of Mr. Ticknor, the common conscience of the mid-century in the New England capital insists on showing, at this distance of time, as the richer for it.

That, then, was one of the missed elements, but the consequent melancholy, I ought promptly to add, formed the most appropriate soil for stray sprouts of tenderness in respect to the few aspects that had not suffered. The old charm of Mount Vernon Street, for instance, wandering up the hill, almost from the water-side, to the rear of the State House, and fairly hanging about there to rest like some good flushed lady, of more than middle age, a little spent and "blown"—this ancient grace was not only still to be felt, but was charged, for depth of interest, with intenser ghostly presences, the rich growth of time, which might have made the ample slope, as one mounted, appear as beatifically peopled as Jacob's Ladder. That was exactly the kind of impression to be desired and welcomed; since ghosts belong only to places and suffer and perish with them. It was as if they themselves, moreover, were taking pleasure in this place, fairly indeed commending to me the fine old style of the picture. Nothing less appeared to account for my not having, in the other age, done it, as the phrase is, full justice, recognized in it so excellent a peace, such a clear Boston bravery—all to the end that it should quite strike me, on the whole, as not only, for the minor stretch and the domestic note, the happiest street-scene the country could show, but as pleasant, on those respectable lines, in a degree not surpassed even among outland pomps. Oh, the wide benignity of brick, the goodly, friendly, ruddy fronts, the felicity of scale, the solid *seat* of everything, even to the handful of happy deviations from the regular, produced, we may fancy, by one of those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"historic" causes which so rarely complicate, for humanization, the blankness of the American street-page, and the occasional occurrence of which in general, as I am perhaps too repeatedly noting, excites on the part of the starved story-seeker a fantastic insistence! I find myself willing, after all, to let my whole estimate of these mere mild monuments of private worth pass for extravagant, if it but leave me a perch for musing on the oddity of our nature which makes us still like the places we have known or loved to grow old, when we can scarcely bear it in the people. To walk down Mount Vernon Street to Charles was to have a brush with that truth, to recognize at least that we like the sense of age to come, locally, when it comes with the right accompaniments, with the preservation of character and the continuity of tradition, merits I had been admiring on the brow of the eminence. From the other vision, the sight of the "decline in the social scale," the lapse into shabbiness and into bad company, we only suffer, for the ghosts in that case either refused to linger, or linger at the most with faces ashamed, and as if appealing against their association.

Such was the condition of the Charles Street ghosts, it seemed to me—shades of a past that had once been so thick and warm and happy; they moved, dimly, through a turbid medium in which the signs of their old life looked soiled and sordid. Each of them was there, indeed, from far, far back; they met me on the pavement, yet it was as if we could pass but in conscious silence, and nothing could have helped us, for any courage of communion, if we had not enjoyed the one merciful refuge that remained, where indeed we could breathe again, and with intensity, our own liberal air. Here, behind the effaced anonymous door, was the little ark of the modern deluge, here still the long drawing-room that looks over the water and toward the sunset, with a seat for every visiting shade, from far-away Thackeray down, and relics and tokens so thick on its walls as to make it positively, in all the town, the votive temple to memory. Ah, if it hadn't been for *that* small patch of common ground, with its kept echo of the very accent of the past, the revisiting spirit, at the bottom of the hill, could but have muffled his head, or but have stifled his heart, and turned away forever. Let me even say that—always now at the bottom of the hill—it was in this practical guise he afterwards, at the best, found himself roaming. It is from about that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point southward that the new splendors of Boston spread, and will clearly continue to spread; but it opened out to me as a tract pompous and prosaic, with which the little interesting city, the city of character and genius, exempt as yet from the Irish yoke, had absolutely nothing to do. The disconnection was complete, and the southward, the westward, territory, made up, at the most, a platform or stage from which the other, the concentrated Boston of history, the Boston of Emerson, Thoreau, Hawthorne, Longfellow, Lowell, Holmes, Ticknor, Motley, Prescott, Parkman and the rest (in the sense either of birthplace or of central or sacred city) could be seen in as definite and, indeed now in almost as picturesquely mediæval, a concretion, appear to make as black and minute and "composed" a little pyramidal image, as the finished background of a Dürer print. It seemed to place itself there in the middle distance, on the sharp salience of its commingled Reforms and Reserves—reformers and reservists rubbing shoulders in the common distinctness of their detachment from an inexpressive generation, and the composition rounding itself about as with the very last of its loose ends snipped off or tucked in.

III.

There are neither loose ends nor stray flutters, whether of the old prose or the old poetry, to be encountered on the large lower level, though there are performances of a different order, in the shadow of which such matters tend to look merely and perhaps rather meagrely subjective. It is all very rich and prosperous and monotonous, the large lower level, but oh, so inexpressibly vacant! Where the "new land" corresponds most to its name, rejoices most visibly and complacently in its newness, its dumped and shovelled foundations the home till recently of a mere vague marine backwater, there the long, straight residential avenues, vistas quite documentary, as one finds one's self pronouncing them, testify with a perfection all their own to a whole vast side of American life. The winter winds and snows, and the eternal dust, run races in them over the clearest course anywhere provided for that grim competition; the league-long brick pavements mirror the expensive void, for many months of the year, in their smooth tight ice-coats (and ice over brick can only be described as heels over head), and the innumerable windows, up and down, watch each other, all hopelessly, as for revelations,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indiscretions, audible, resonant, rebellious or explosive breakages of the pane from within, that never disturb the peace. (No one will begin, and the buried hatchet, in spite of whatever wistful looks to where it lies, is never dug up.) So it is that these sustained affirmations of one of the smoothest and the most settled social states "going," excite perversely, on the part of the restless analyst, questions that would seem logically the very least involved. We call such aspects "documentary" because they strike us, more than any others, as speaking volumes for the possible *serenity*, the common decency, the quiet cohesion, of a vast commercial and professional *bourgeoisie* left to itself. Here was such an order caught in the very fact, the fact of its living maximum. A *bourgeoisie* without an aristocracy to worry it is, of course, a very different thing from a *bourgeoisie* struggling *in* that shade, and nothing could express more than these interminable perspectives of security the condition of a community leading its life in the social sun.

Why, accordingly, of December afternoons, did the restless analyst, pausing at eastward-looking corners, find on his lips the vague refrain of Tennyson's "long, unlovely street"? Why, if Harley Street, if Wimpole, is unlovely, should Marlborough Street, Boston, be so—beyond the mere platitude of its motiveless name? Here is no monotony of black leasehold brick, no patent disavowal, in the interest of stale and strictly subordinate gentilities, of expression, animation, variety, curiosity; here, on the contrary, is often the individual housefront in all its independence and sometimes in all its felicity; this whole region being, like so many such regions in the United States to-day, the home of the free hand, a field for the liveliest architectural experiment. There are interesting, admirable houses—though always too much of the detestable vitreous "bow"—and there is above all what there is everywhere in America for saving, or at least for propping up, the situation, that particular look of the clear course and large opportunity ahead, which, when taken in conjunction with all the will to live, all the money to spend, all the knowledge to acquire and apply, seems to marshal the material possibilities in glittering illimitable ranks. Beacon Street, moreover, used to stretch back like a workable telescope for the focussing, at its higher extremity, in an air of which the positive defect is to be too seldom prejudicial, of the gilded dome of the State

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

House fresh as a Christmas toy seen across the floor of a large salubrious nursery. This made a civic vignette that furnished a little the desert of cheerful family life. But Marlborough Street, for imperturbable reasons of its own, used, periodically, to break my heart. It was of no use to make a vow of hanging about till I should have sounded my mystery—learned to say *why* black, stale Harley Street, for instance, in featureless row after row, had character and depth, while what was before me fell upon my sense with the thinness of tone of a precocious child—and still more why this latter effect should have been, as it were, so insistently irritating. If there be strange ways of producing an interest, to the critical mind, there are doubtless still stranger ways of not producing one, and it was important to me, no doubt, to make "my" defunct and compact and expressive little Boston appear to don all the signs of that character that the New Land, and what is built thereon, miss. How could one consider the place at all unless in a light?—so that one had to decide definitely on one's light.

This it was, after all, easy to do from the moment one had determined to concede to the New Land the fact of possession of everything convenient and handsome under heaven. Peace could always come with this recognition of all the accessories and equipments, a hundred costly things, parks and palaces and institutions, that the earlier community had lacked; and there was an individual connection—only one, presently to be noted—in which the actual city might seem for an hour to have no capacity for the uplifting *idea*, no aptitude for the finer curiosity, to envy the past. But, meanwhile, it was strange that even so fine a conception, finely embodied, as the new Public Library, magnificently superseding all others, was committed to speak to one's inner perception still more of the power of the purse, and of the higher turn for business than of the old intellectual, or even of the old moral, sensibility. Why else, then, should one have thought of some single, some admirable, hour of Emerson, in one of the dusky, primitive lecture-halls that have ceased to be, or of some large insuperable antislavery eloquence of Wendell Phillips's, during the same term and especially during the War, as breathing more of the consciousness of literature and of history than all the promiscuous bustle of the Florentine palace by Copley Square? Not that this latter edifice, the fruit of immense considerations,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has not its honorable interest too; which it would have if only in the light of the constant truth that almost any American application or practice of a general thought puts on a new and original aspect. Public libraries are a thoroughly general thought, and one has seen plenty of them, one is seeing dreadfully many, in these very days, the world over; yet to be confronted with an American example is to have sight straightway of more difference than community, and to glean on the spot fresh evidence of that democratic way of dealing which it has been the American office to translate from an academic phrase into a bristling fact. The notes of difference of the Florentine palace by Copley Square —more delicately elegant, in truth, if less sublimely rugged, than most Florentine palaces—resolve themselves, like so many such notes everywhere, into our impression here, once more, that every one is "in" everything, whereas in Europe so comparatively few persons are in anything (even as yet in society, more and more the common refuge or retreat of the masses).

The Boston institution, then, is a great and complete institution, with this reserve of its striking the restored absentee as practically without *penetralia*. A library without *penetralia* may affect him but as a temple without altars; it will, at any rate, exemplify the distinction between a benefit given and a benefit taken, a borrowed, a lent, and an owned, an appropriated, convenience. The British Museum, the Louvre, the Bibliothèque Nationale, the treasures of South Kensington, are assuredly, under forms, at the disposal of the people; but it is to be observed, I think, that the people walk there more or less under the shadow of the right waited for and conceded. It remains as difficult as it is always interesting, however, to trace the detail (much of it obvious enough, but much more indefinable) of the personal port of a democracy that, unlike the English, is social as well as political. One of these denotements is that social democracies are unfriendly to the preservation of *penetralia;* so that when *penetralia* are of the essence, as in a place of study and meditation, they inevitably go to the wall. The main staircase in Boston, has, with its amplitude of wing and its splendor of tawny marble, a high and luxurious beauty—bribing the restored absentee to emotion, moreover, by expanding, monumentally, at one of its rests, into admirable commemoration of the Civil War service of the two great Massachusetts Volunteer regiments

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of *élite*. Such visions, such felicities, such couchant lions and recorded names and stirred memories as these, encountered in the early autumn twilight, color an impression—even though to say so be the limit of breach of the silence in which, for persons of the generation of the author of these pages, appreciation of them can best take refuge: the refuge to which I felt myself anon reduced, for instance, opposite the State House, in presence of Saint-Gaudens's noble and exquisite monument to Robert Gould Shaw and the Fifty-fourth Massachusetts. There are works of memorial art that may suddenly place themselves, by their operation in a given case, outside articulate criticism—which was what happened, I found, in respect to the main feature, the rich staircase of the Library. Another way in which the bribe, as I have called it, of that masterpiece worked on the spot was by prompting one to immediate charmed perception of the character of the deep court and inner arcade of the palace, where a wealth of science and taste has gone to producing a sense, when the afternoon light sadly slants, of one of the myriad gold-colored courts of the Vatican.

These are the refinements of the present Boston—keeping company as they can with the healthy animation, as it struck me, of the rest of the building; the multitudinous bustle, the coming and going, as in a railway-station, of persons with carpet-bags and other luggage, the simplicity of plan, the open doors and immediate accesses, admirable *for* a railway-station, the ubiquitous children, *most* irrepressible little democrats of the democracy, the vain quest, above all, of the deeper depths aforesaid, some part that should be sufficiently *within* some other part, sufficiently withdrawn and consecrated, not to constitute a thoroughfare. Perhaps I didn't adequately explore; but there was always the visible scale and scheme of the building. It was a shock to find the so brave decorative designs of Puvis de Chavannes, of Sargent and Abbey and John Elliott, hanging over mere chambers of familiarity and resonance; and then, I must quickly add, it was a shock still greater perhaps to find one had no good reason for defending them against such freedoms. What was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander: had one not in other words, in the public places and under the great loggias of Italy, acclaimed it as just the charm and dignity of these resorts that, in their pictured and embroidered state, they still serve for the graceful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

common life? It was true that one had not been imprisoned in that consistency in the Laurentian, in the Ambrosian Library—and at any rate one was here on the edge of abysses. Was it not splendid, for example, to see, in Boston, such large provision made for the amusement of children on rainy afternoons?—so many little heads bent over their story-books that the edifice took on at moments the appearance worn, one was to observe later on, by most other American edifices of the same character, that of a lively distributing-house of the new fiction for the young. The note was bewildering—yet, would one, snatching the bread-and-molasses from their lips, cruelly deprive the young of rights in which they have been installed with a majesty nowhere else approaching that of their American installation? I am not wrong, probably, at all events, in qualifying such a question as that as abysmal, and I remember how, more than once, I took refuge from it in craven flight, straight across the Square, to the already so interesting, the so rapidly expanding, Art Museum.

There, for some reason, questions exquisitely dropped; perhaps only for the reason that things sifted and selected have, very visibly, the effect of challenging the confidence even of the rash. It is of the nature of objects doomed to show distinction to make more or less of a desert round them, and peace reigned unbroken, I usually found, in the two or three Museum rooms that harbor a small but deeply interesting and steadily growing collection of fragments of the antique. Here the restless analyst found work to his hand—only too much; and indeed in presence of the gem of the series, of the perhaps just too conscious grace of a certain little wasted and dim-eyed head of Aphrodite, he felt that his function should simply give way, in common decency, to that of the sonneteer. For it is an impression by itself, and I think quite worth the Atlantic voyage, to catch in the American light the very fact of the genius of Greece. There are things we don't know, feelings not to be foretold, till we have had that experience—which I commend to the *raffiné* of almost any other clime. I should say to him that he has not *seen* a fine Greek thing till he has seen it in America. It is, of course, on the face of it, the *most* merciless case of transplanting—the mere moral of which, none the less, for application, becomes by no means flagrant. The little Aphrodite, with her connections, her antecedents and references, exhibiting the maximum of breakage, is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no doubt as *lonely* a jewel as ever strayed out of its setting; yet, what does one quickly recognize but that the intrinsic lustre will have, so far as that may be possible, doubled. She has lost her background, the divine creature—has lost her company, and is keeping, in a manner, the strangest; but so far from having lost an iota of her power, she has gained unspeakably more, since what she essentially stands for she here stands for alone, rising ineffably to the occasion. She has in short, by her single presence, as yet, annexed an empire, and there are strange glimmers of moments when, as I have spoken of her consciousness, the very knowledge of this seems to lurk in the depth of her beauty. Where was she ever more, where was she ever so much, a goddess —and who knows but that, being thus divine, she foresees the time when, as she has "moved over," the place of her actual whereabouts will have become one of her shrines? Objects doomed to distinction make round them a desert, I have said; but that is only for any gross confidence in other matters. For confidence in *them* they make a garden, and that is why I felt this quarter of the Boston Art Museum bloom, under the indescribable dim eyes, with delicate flowers. The impression swallowed up every other; the place, whatever it was, was supremely justified, and I was left cold by learning that a much bigger and grander and richer place is presently to overtop it.

The present establishment "dates back," back almost to the good Boston of the middle years, and is full of all sorts of accumulated and concentrated pleasantness; which fact precisely gives the signal, by the terrible American law, for its coming to an end and giving a chance to the untried. It is a consistent application of the rotary system—the untried always awaiting its turn, and quite perceptibly stamping and snorting while it waits; all heedless as it is, poor innocent untried, of the certain hour of the impatiences before which it too will have to topple. It is not, indeed, that the American laws, so operating, have not almost always their own queer interest; founded as they are, all together, on one of the strongest of the native impulses. We see this characteristic again and again at play, see it in especial wherever we see (which is more than frequently enough), a University or a College "started" or amplified. This process almost always takes the form, primarily, of more lands and houses and halls and rooms, more swimming-baths and football-fields and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gymnasia, a greater luxury of brick and mortar, a greater ingenuity, the most artful conceivable, of accommodation and installation. Such is the magic, such the presences, that tend more than any other, to figure *as* the institution, thereby perverting not a little, as need scarce be remarked, the finer collegiate idea: the theory being, doubtless, and again most characteristically, that with all the wrought stone and oak and painted glass, the immense provision, the multiplied marbles and tiles and cloisters and acres, "people will come,"—that is, individuals of value will—and in some manner work some miracle. In the early American time, doubtless, individuals of value had to wait too much for things; but that is now made up by the way things are waiting for individuals of value. To which I must immediately add, however—and it is the ground of my allusion of a moment ago—that no impression of the "new" Boston can feel itself hang together without remembrance of what it owes to that rare exhibition of the living spirit lately achieved, in the interest of the fine arts, and of all that is noblest in them, by the unaided and quite heroic genius of a private citizen. To attempt to tell the story of the wonderfully gathered and splendidly lodged Gardner Collection would be to displace a little the line that separates private from public property; and yet to find no discreet word for it is to appear to fail of feeling for the complexity of conditions amid which so undaunted a devotion to a great idea (undaunted by the battle to fight, losing alas! with State Protection of native art, and with other scarce less uncanny things) has been able consummately to flower. It is in presence of the results magnificently attained, the energy triumphant over everything, that one feels the fine old disinterested tradition of Boston least broken.

HENRY JAMES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF THE AMERICAN CONSULAR SERVICE.

BY FRANCIS B. LOOMIS, FORMERLY THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

In spite of opposition in Congress, sometimes frankly emphatic and at all times sufficiently effective, sentiment favorable to the reorganization of the United States Consular Service has grown substantially within the last decade and found widespread, though spasmodic and unsystematic, expression. To-day, every Board of Trade, Chamber of Commerce and other commercial and industrial association directly or remotely interested in the growth of the foreign commerce of the United States is demanding the improvement and the strengthening of our Consular Service. For nearly half a century, there has been persistent lack of legislation looking to the systematic development and increased usefulness of that Service.

During these long years of neglect, the whole scheme of international commerce and interoceanic communication has been transformed. Portions of the laws of the United States relative to the Consular Service have been made obsolete by the advent of rapid communication afforded by steam-railways, steamships and ocean cables. Consulates in various parts of the world, which thirty-five or forty years ago were of salient importance, have, owing to the decadence of our merchant marine, ceased to be places worth considering; while many other posts, which either did not exist, or were of scant consequence, have, by reason of changed conditions, or variations in the current of international trade, assumed great importance, and now require for their proper administration a high order of ability and liberal maintenance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I.

The Consular Service has been one of the most notable of governmental derelicts. It is understood in commercial circles, and has been for a considerable time, that our Consular Service is not all it ought to be, and many well-meant suggestions have been communicated to the Department of State, some of which may ultimately be embodied in a definite and systematic plan of reform. Almost every one is aware of the obvious defects in our Consular system, but very few persons seem to know how difficult it is to correct obvious and admitted evils, when their eradication means the destruction of an existing system and the substitution of something substantially new in its stead.

It must not be supposed that the Consular system as now organized is wholly inadequate, or that it is not responsive in a considerable degree to the growing needs and opportunities of this country in the markets of the world. Those who have had occasion to study at first hand, and from the vantage-point of official station, the operation of our Consular system during the last twelve or fourteen years find a steady and encouraging improvement in the character and ability of the personnel, and in the quality of the work performed.

Mr. Blaine made an earnest endeavor to secure the appointment of well-equipped men to the Consular Corps, and Mr. Cleveland rendered a conspicuous service when he issued his order providing that applicants for Consular positions, the compensations of which are not less than one thousand dollars nor more than twenty-five hundred dollars a year, should be examined as to their fitness. Persons already in the service, those who had been in it or who were in the service of the Department of State in Washington, were exempted from these examinations. Within a few weeks, President Roosevelt has extended the scope of Mr. Cleveland's order, and now all candidates for appointment to a Consular position, the annual compensation of which exceeds one thousand dollars, must submit to examination.

It is the purpose of Secretary Root to make the examinations more searching, and to alter the system of marking in order distinctly to add to its effectiveness. No considerable change in the character or scope of the examination is contemplated. These examinations are designed to be practical tests of fitness. When a candidate for appointment has been designated for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

examination by the President, he is furnished with a volume of the Consular Regulations; and, after he has had ample time to study them, he is required to answer a number of sensible questions respecting the official duties of Consular officers. The applicant is also required to know something of Geography, Commercial History, and to have information concerning the business character of the post for which he has been designated. He is expected, also, to have some knowledge of his own Government, and to be able to explain the functions and workings of its various branches.

Eventually, candidates for appointment to the Consular Service will be required to speak at least one foreign language. If the service is put upon a permanent basis and men enter it with the expectation of making it a career, they ought in the beginning to know Spanish and French. The candidate's personal appearance and address and his manner of speech are also considered in making up the estimate of his fitness; and, if the examinations served no other good purpose, they would afford opportunity to see the applicant and enable one to judge by personal observation what sort of an official he would be likely to make. It has sometimes happened that Consuls have been appointed and gone to their posts without calling upon the President, the Secretary of State or any of the latter's assistants. Indeed, a few Consuls were never seen by any one in authority until they had returned to this country from their posts, and I have heard Presidents state with unmistakable emphasis that, had they seen such and such a Consul prior to his appointment, he would never have been commissioned.

II.

President Roosevelt's important order of November 10th also applies to one branch of the Diplomatic Service. Henceforth, candidates for appointment as Secretary of Embassy or of Legation will be required to pass a special Departmental examination. Neither this examination nor the one required of applicants for appointment to the Consular Service is competitive. Candidates who wish to enter the Diplomatic Service in the capacity of Secretary of Embassy or of Legation will be required to speak one foreign language. That is, it will be expected of them to know either French or the language of the country to which they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are likely to be sent. In addition to this, they will be examined in the elements of international law and in diplomatic usage.

The result of the examination of the candidates for Consular appointments has been excellent. As I have said, the standard of ability and the character of the personnel have been raised. A considerable number of applicants have been rejected, and those who have passed with credit, when commissioned, have gone to their posts with a much more definite knowledge of the work expected of them than was often the case in the days before Mr. Cleveland's order was issued. These fine results will be strongly augmented by the President's recent extension of that order.

During President Roosevelt's incumbency, the Consular Service has been severely and systematically purged. Great care has been exercised, so far as the appointing power is concerned, in the selection of new officials. Not only has the President dismissed dishonest men wherever he has found them, but he has removed a number of men who, as he graphically phrases it, were "simply marking time"—officials who were incompetent, careless about their duties and responsibilities, or indifferent to them. Every vacancy that has occurred since Mr. Roosevelt became President has been filled, so far as was practicable, by promoting deserving men already in the Service, and such promotions have been made, generally speaking, without reference to politics or political influence. Not half a dozen removals solely for political reasons have been made in the Consular Service within the last four years. The first consideration with the President and Department of State is the man's merit, his worth and his fitness for the particular vacancy for which he is being considered. Mr. Hay, by reason of his ripe experience and his wide acquaintance abroad and in this country, was able to improve the personnel of the Service, and he was particularly felicitous in putting "the right man in the right place."

No man fought more persistently and valiantly to lift the Consular Service from the plane of partisan politics than Mr. Hay, and no man accomplished more in this field of patriotic endeavor than did he. His successor, Mr. Root, with all the strength of his keen and luminous mind, has taken up the work at the advanced point where Mr. Hay laid it down, and already his influence has made itself felt to the great advantage of the whole American foreign service.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III.

The Consular Service of the United States is not without great respectability and merit. The unusual responsibility thrown upon our Consular officers, many of whom were quite inexperienced men, during the war with Spain, and which was met in a manful and efficient way proved this. The American Consuls rendered valuable service to the military and naval arms of the Government during the period of hostilities; so much so, indeed, that the late President McKinley, who had appointed the great majority of them, was deeply gratified at their manifestation of resourcefulness and patriotism. The grievous faults of our Consular Service are faults of the system rather than of the men who fill the posts under it.

Few specific and well-grounded charges of incompetency or of ill-doing on the part of Consular officers are filed with the Department of State. Every complaint that seems to have a reasonable degree of substance is promptly considered, but the Department's means for investigation are often inadequate, in that we have no Inspectors, who can be called upon to investigate remote Consuls and make a report respecting the conduct of the official and his office. Recently, the Department of State has been compelled to have a naval vessel from Manila go to a Consulate in one of the Pacific Islands to investigate a Consular officer. The case was urgent, and fortunately there was a vessel in commission which was free for a short period and could make the desired journey. The Department of State has been much assisted in its surveillance of the Consular Corps by the reports of Naval officers, whose observations are generally both just and informing.

But one of the most vital and immediate needs of the Consular Service is adequate provision for regular and thorough inspection. The Secretary of State feels the urgency of this demand and has asked Congress to make an appropriation for the payment of salaries to five Inspectors, who are to be called Consuls-General at large. It would be entirely useless, however, to appoint Inspectors, unless they can be liberally paid. It will be of no advantage to the Government to send out men of mediocre talent and slender equipment for this duty. Inspectors should be men of uncommon intelligence and of wide experience in Consular or Treasury Customs work. Congress cannot afford

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to employ cheap men for this service. It would be quite as well to make no appropriation unless the appropriation can be made upon a liberal and enlightened basis. The work will be arduous, responsible, and always important. The men who perform it ought to be men who reach a mental and moral standard equal to that expected of United States District and Circuit Judges. They ought to be as well paid as any official in the Consular Service. If Congress does nothing else for the improvement and uplifting of the Consular Service this session, it ought, at least, to comply with the recommendation of the Secretary of State for an appropriation that will enable him to secure the appointment of the kind of inspectors he desires. It goes without saying that these appointments should be left unreservedly to the discretion of the President and the Secretary of State, and that no political or other extraneous influence should be brought to bear in connection with them.

It is to be regretted that it is still the practice of some writers and speakers, as well as of some travellers and business men, to make sweeping denunciations of the Consular Service. We still hear it loosely asserted that "American Consuls are ignorant, often drunken, and not infrequently dishonest, that they no sooner learn their duties than they are straightway dismissed to make room for political heelers." This may fairly be said to be the gist and style of the current and careless criticism of our Consular Service. Most of the people who indulge in this violent and indiscriminate denunciation are ill informed regarding our service, or else they are mere lovers of sensation who have a fancy for making shocking statements. When people of this class attack the Consular Service in an unrestrained way they are not only guilty of bad taste, but also deficient in patriotism.

I once read a letter, written in solemn vein, to the editor of a New York newspaper, by an American woman who had recently returned from Europe, and who, while there, thought that she had not been quite well treated by one of our Consuls, who held a fifteen-hundred-dollar post in a small, unattractive and insalubrious city. She complained bitterly of the Consul, and observed that he was not a polished gentleman, and that he was lacking in *savoir-faire*. She closed her letter with what she deemed a pertinent inquiry: "Why cannot all of our Consular

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

positions be filled by men of the Sir Julian Pauncefote type?"

This is a sample of a good deal of the criticism and comment concerning the Consular Corps which reaches the Department of State. I am sure no one regrets more keenly than the appointing power at Washington that the visible supply of men of the Sir Julian Pauncefote type is forever greatly exceeded by the demand. It might, also, occur to the lady who made the inquiry referred to that men who are fit to be ambassadors cannot usually be employed for fifteen hundred dollars a year.

Under the present faulty system, some undesirable men get into the Service,—men whose presence abroad is a source of humiliation and discomfort to those of their fellow countrymen who happen to meet them. Such men, I am glad to say, are the exception and not the rule, and it is no secret that it is the earnest desire of the Administration to remove officials of this type whenever proper information concerning them is brought to the attention of the Department of State. The President wants our Consular officers, as well as our Diplomatic officers, to be representative of the best breeding and good feeling of the country, and he thinks that it would be much easier to secure men of this desirable type were Congress to reorganize the Consular establishment and place it upon a more permanent basis.

IV.

To meet the growing demand of the business interests of this country for a steady and systematic enlargement of its export commerce, a properly organized Consular Corps could render services of inestimable value. On account of the difficult and laborious work of authenticating or "legalizing" invoices of goods that are to be exported to the United States, American Consular officers are required to meet responsibilities and conditions more difficult and more varied than are the Consular officers of any other foreign service. It is not overstating the case to say that annually more than $2,500,000 is added to the revenue of the United States in customs duties, by reason of the watchfulness and conscientious performance of duty on the part of Consular officers, who discover undervaluation in the invoices of goods for exportation to this country, and who by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their alertness and special knowledge cause prices to be advanced and largely increased duties to be collected.

Not only are Consuls expected to have a knowledge of the market values of the foreign products which are likely to come to this country, but each Consul is required to report every opportunity in his district for the extension of the American export trade. He is also expected carefully to observe the industries, the manufacturing and other industrial enterprises in the section of the foreign country in which he lives, and to report concisely and lucidly the important innovations, experiments and inventions which may be of interest or significance to his own countrymen. He is also asked to collect a great deal of statistical information, and to give regular and frequent reports concerning sanitary conditions.

In addition to these duties, if he is at a seaport, he is charged with the protection of American seamen, and incidentally is preyed upon by American tramps of all descriptions, and compelled to make large charitable donations from his own pocket. The Government, in its infinite goodness and mercy, makes no provision whatsoever for the assistance of suffering or stranded Americans abroad other than seamen.

A high degree of usefulness in the Consular Service requires not only experience, but natural aptitude. It requires the trained discernment which recognizes promptly and accurately important events, and, above all, requires industry, together with a patriotic conception of duty which impels an officer to remain faithfully at his post and work. "These are qualities of temperament and character, the presence or absence of which no formal examination, however useful in other respects, can with certainty reveal."

One of the questions most frequently asked by members of that considerable body of men who are working earnestly, and with every promise of success, for the improvement of the Consular Service is, "Who make the best Consuls? From what class of men have our most successful Consuls come?" The question, owing to the fact that there is no formal efficiency record, is difficult to answer. One may throw some light on this phase of the subject, however, by restating what the most experienced Consular officer in the United States Service once wrote to a friend who asked these same questions. The officer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

answered by a process of elimination, and pointed out the following persons, who, experience has shown, are least likely to rise to efficiency and usefulness in the Consular Service. They are:

1. Young men who go abroad with the intention of using their Consular position as a convenience while they complete their education, as artists, lawyers, physicians, or architects, by study and attendance at lectures in some neighboring art school, polytechnic institute or university.

2. Aged professional men, who seek Consular appointments to obtain rest from their work as lawyers, clergymen and physicians, for which alone they were qualified by early education and mature experience.

3. Invalids, who choose a special Consulate on account of its benign climate or proximity to a desirable physician, health resort or sanitarium.

4. Men with families who wish to reside abroad for the education of their children.

5. Men who have special business interests in Consular districts to which they ask to be assigned, in order that they may have the support and influence of a Consular position while working for their own profit and interest.

6. Young men of unformed character and dissolute, idle habits, whose families seek to place them in public positions abroad, in order to escape the responsibility and embarrassment of their presence at home.

7. Men who are so confident of having earned Consular preferment by political services that they will treat their four years of residence abroad as the simple discharge of a debt by the United States Government.

It is too often stated, at least interrogatively, that the ideal Consul is to be found in the ranks of our business men. Perhaps this would be true, were we dealing with ideals; but, as a matter of fact, men who possess the requisite qualities to make successful careers in commerce or industry cannot often be spared from these fields of activity. Experienced business men do not find Consulates carrying a compensation of twenty-five hundred dollars a year attractive or satisfactory. The so-called business men who seek Consular positions are as a rule (there are some happy exceptions) men who have met with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

little or no success in business, or men who have grown old in one form of commercial activity, and who, as a consequence, are narrow, and perform their duties in a perfunctory and unintelligent manner. Experience shows clearly that business men thrust into the Consular Service without previous knowledge of the work, and after passing middle life, too often make inefficient officers. A man who has spent forty or fifty years buying and selling fish or nails is not necessarily, because he has done this work with profit to himself, just the person to make a desirable Consul-General at Cairo, Havana or Hongkong.

Patient study of our Consular Corps for the last twelve or fourteen years shows that, on the whole, a larger number of successful Consuls have come from the ranks of Journalism than from any other class or vocation. Self-respecting, active newspaper men almost invariably make efficient Consuls. They are trained observers; they know how to describe concisely what they see; and their reports are informing and clear. They are likely to understand the art of getting on pleasantly with foreign officials, and are intelligent, intensely patriotic, have a saving sense of humor, and do not often yield to the temptation of boasting of their own country and its achievements.

The Army and Navy have contributed some excellent officials to the Consular Service, as have all of the learned professions. It is a distinct advantage for a Consul to have had some active experience in professional or business life prior to entering the foreign service. One of the greatest advantages which American Consular officers have over foreign Consuls is that they have touched life at many points before entering the employment of the Government.

European Consular officers are trained for the service and make a career of it, but often the very fact that they are so trained isolates them and keeps them apart from their fellow countrymen, or rather from acquiring intimate and accurate knowledge of what those fellow countrymen are thinking and doing. The young man who begins to be a Consul at twenty or twenty-two years of age, and who steps from his college into a Consulate, may eventually be an official of great value to his country, but the chances are that he will be a long while in the making.

In this connection, consideration of the all-important ques-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of tenure or length of term for Consular officers suggests itself. In the well-established and highly organized Consular establishments appertaining to various European Governments, the Consul is in effect appointed for life. He is expected to serve for a long period—forty or fifty years, perhaps. Then he is retired on half or three-quarters pay. But, manifestly, this plan has its disadvantages, as well as its advantages. It is found that the tendency of life tenure is to make a man easily satisfied, to stifle ambition, and to bring about an accumulation of "dead timber" in the service.

American Consuls are said to be more alert, more observing, and more usefully industrious than many of their foreign colleagues. This is not merely my own assertion, but one that has been made many times in foreign trade journals and in national legislative assemblies at various European capitals. It may surprise many of the critics of our Consular Service to know that serious-minded foreign students of the subject often point to it as a model of efficiency, and that they never fail to proclaim the excellence of the reports written by American Consular officers.

The frequent changes in office bring to the service new men with new points of view, fresh enthusiasm and an insatiable desire for work. The best of them want to make so excellent a record in four years that the welfare of the service may seem imperatively to demand their retention; and this effect of the present system unfolds one of the most unfortunate and pathetic features of our service. It is much to be deplored, when a Consul has striven earnestly and well for a number of years and has given during that period the very best there is in him, losing no opportunity to make himself valuable to his country, that, without a single word of warning he should be, for political reasons, superseded by a new official. This little tragedy has occurred hundreds of times, but it is gratifying to state that during the last four years its enactment has conspicuously decreased

Consuls should be kept in office as long as they render good service and are in every way satisfactory. If they serve the country well for forty years, they ought to be retired on half pay. But, whether they enter the service through the designation by the President, or through the medium of a competitive examination, the way for their prompt retirement for such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

causes as inefficiency, dishonesty or carelessness should be made easy and kept unobstructed.

A system of promotion should be established; and officers who do not reach a specified grade by the time they have attained a certain age should be dropped from the service, as should all those whose efficiency record falls below a fixed standard of excellence. If some such plan as this could be adopted, a current of promotion could be maintained, and there would be a constant influx of fresh blood.

V.

There are hopeful indications from many sources that legislative action providing for important changes in our Consular Service will be shortly forthcoming. It is important, therefore, at this time, to understand correctly the main facts affecting our Consular Service, and to know something about actual conditions. It is agreed by those who have been studying the matter from points of vantage for many years, and with a knowledge of what is practicable and what is impracticable, and who understand the grave difficulties in the way of securing legislation calculated radically to change existing conditions and ultimately to take the Consular Service out of politics, that it is better and wiser to ask at the present time for what we may reasonably expect to obtain, instead of wasting energy and time in crying for the moon and demanding immediate, radical and revolutionary reorganization of the whole foreign service. Therefore, Senator Lodge's excellent bill has been revised from time to time, until now it asks but two vitally essential things, namely: the grading of the Consular Service, and the establishing of salaries to correspond with the various grades.

The grading of the Consular Service means the establishment of a number of classes, so that in future a man will be appointed to a grade or class, and not to a particular post, as is now the case. In the army a man is appointed to be a Second Lieutenant, not a Second Lieutenant at Fort Sheridan or at Fort Thomas. Hereafter, it is of the first importance that Consuls should be appointed to a class or grade, and that the President should have the power to assign them to any post of duty embraced within the grade to which they have been designated or commissioned. Also, the aim is to classify Consulates according

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to their importance and compensation. There can be no real improvement in the Consular Service unless the President and Secretary of State be given the power to move Consuls about in order to use men where they can be employed to the best advantage. This is the second important point in the Lodge Bill.

I agree entirely in principle with the objects sought to be attained by the Lodge Bill, but I would like to see more liberal allowances made in the way of compensations than is provided for in the bill recently introduced by Senator Lodge. Should this bill become a law, the salaries provided by it would represent the Consul's sole source of official income, because all fees would be swept away, so far as the Consul is concerned, and turned over to the Government. The Consul's salary will be his only source of official income. It is a matter of the utmost difficulty to have official salaries increased; and, if the salaries of the Consuls are presently to be readjusted, it is probable that they will remain as fixed for at least a quarter of a century, and possibly longer. Many of the Consular salaries paid to-day were established in 1856, when the necessary expenses of living in Continental Europe were not more than one-third as great as they are at present.

The country can afford to pay its Consuls well, and public sentiment in the United States is heartily in favor of liberal treatment of Consular officers by the Government. The one hundred and twenty thousand Americans who visit Europe annually expect to find their Consular representative a man whose mode of living, whose ability, whose character and whose standing are such as to command the respect of the community in which he resides, and they have a right to expect that he will be a source of pride to his visiting fellow countrymen. The American who goes abroad wants his Consular representative to live in a manner in keeping with the dignity of the potent and opulent nation which he represents. Not only for these reasons can the Government afford to pay its Consular officers well, but it can afford the outlay, for the reason that the service is almost a self-sustaining one.

Last year the net cost of the Consular Service to the Government was only $144,152. United States Consular officers collected and paid into the Treasury $1,188,383. The difference between this sum and the cost of the maintenance of the Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sular Service was the figures first quoted. About a million dollars is collected annually by the United States Consular officers for authenticating invoices. The charge for this service is $2 50. There is no reason why the fee for this service should not be increased. If it were $3 50, the Consular Service would pay a large profit to the Government.

Probably a graduated scale of charges based upon the amount of the invoice to be authenticated should be established. This could be so arranged that it would be more just to foreign shippers than the present undeviating rate, and it might be made to augment the income of this Government to such an extent that the Consular salaries could be increased one hundred per cent. without adding a cent to our burden of taxation. At present, the foreign producer who sends a shipment of goods to the United States valued at $200 pays just the same amount for having his invoices legalized as does the shipper who sends goods to the value of $200,000.

Increasing the fee for legalizing invoices to such an extent that the salaries of Consuls could be doubled without increasing the burden upon the Treasury of the United States could be done without working hardship to any one, and probably it would evoke nothing more than a perfunctory protest from some of the foreigners who have large connections in this country.

In the matter of compensation, the Lodge Bill provides for two Consuls-General of the first class at $12,000 a year; for six of the second class, at $8,000 a year; for eight of the third class, at $6,000 a year; for nine of the fourth class, at $5,500 a year; for fourteen of the fifth class, at $4,500 a year; for eight of the sixth class, at $3,500 a year, and four of the seventh class at $3,000 a year; and it also provides for the payment of Consuls by salaries ranging downward from one of the first class, at $8,000 a year, to $1,000 a year in the lowest class.

The salaries proposed for the Consuls-General and for the Consuls of the higher classes are not sufficient. As a plain business proposition, the men who fill these positions should be more liberally compensated. Let us consider an example. The Consul-General at Paris receives a salary of $5,000 a year; the unofficial fees which he receives, being permitted by law to keep and appropriate to his own use, amount to $9,000 or $10,000 a year. If these fees are cut off and appropriated by the Government, it seems only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

just that the Consular officer should receive a salary that would be a fair compensating equivalent. The duties of the Consuls-General at Paris and at London, Shanghai and Berlin are very onerous, their responsibilities grave and unintermittent. The Consuls-General at Paris and London might very well be paid $15,000 a year. It is of the greatest importance to have high-class men; and men of ability and experience, who would be fully equal to the demands of these posts, ought not to be asked to serve abroad for a smaller compensation than $15,000 a year.

The Consuls-General at Shanghai and Berlin should be paid at least $12,000 a year. The post at Shanghai is more important to us commercially than any ten-thousand-dollar diplomatic mission which we maintain. The cost of living is very high and the demands upon the Consul-General are diverse and frequent. He has not only to be acquainted with Consular work, but to know about business, industrial and shipping matters, and, in addition to that, he must hold court and exercise judicial functions.

The Consuls-General of the second-class posts should not, in my opinion, receive less than $10,000 a year, and there are ten posts the incumbents of which should be entitled to payment at this rate. The Consular officers at the following posts ought, I think, by reason of the quality and quantity of work which they are called upon to perform, receive $10,000 a year; Havana, Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Ayres, Valparaiso, Vienna, Rome, St. Petersburg (this office should be transferred to Moscow), Calcutta, Hongkong and Canton. Ten Consuls-General of the third class ought to be compensated at the rate of $8,000 a year; fifteen of the fourth class, at $5,500 a year; fourteen of the fifth class, at $4,500 a year; not more than seven of the sixth class, at $4,000 a year.

The Lodge Bill, as introduced, provided that no applicant under the age of twenty-one years, or over the age of forty-five years, shall be designated for appointment to the Consular Service. That was one of the wise provisions of a carefully considered measure, and one that will make for the good of the service.

It is not only desirable that the President should be empowered to move Consuls about, to respond to the highest need and welfare of the service, but he should also be authorized to summon them to Washington for service in this country from time to time. It is of the first importance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that our Consular officers should be thoroughly, vividly and vitally in touch with commercial life in this country. It often happens that a Consul at a particular post possesses a great deal of important and timely information about some current question, so that it would be much to the advantage of the Secretary of State to have him for a short time in Washington in order to consult with him. Under the present system, the Consul may not be called home for any purpose unless he chooses to come at his own expense.

The Government of the United States does not pay the travelling expenses of any of its officials in the foreign service. A man may be sent to a post seven thousand miles distant, the compensation of which does not exceed $1,500 a year, but he is, nevertheless, compelled to pay all his expenses to and from the post. In every other Department of Government work, a man who travels upon official business is paid the necessary expenses. Why an exception has been made to the disadvantage of the underpaid foreign service, it is impossible to ascertain.

Not only is it most essential for the Department to send for Consuls to consult with them at various times, but it is highly advantageous for the Consul to spend a few weeks from time to time in Washington. He could, also, be used to very great advantage if he were allowed to spend three months in the United States, once in two or three years, for the purpose of lecturing before trade organizations upon practical questions connected with our foreign commerce, suggested to him by his own experience abroad.

At present, I believe, no Consul of the United States, commissioned by the President, is a foreigner. A large number of Vice-Consuls and a considerable number of Consular Agents are not American citizens. It is the policy of the Department of State, whenever it is practicable to do so, to substitute American citizens for foreigners who are filling the posts of Consular Agents. If Congress would make an appropriation for the payment of Vice-Consuls, then the Government could require all these officials to be Americans. Under the present system, the Consul has to pay the Vice-Consul from his own pocket, and in a majority of cases the pay is so small that an American could not afford to leave this country and go abroad for the sake of earning it.

There is now being developed in the Department of State a plan for arriving at some reasonable estimate of the efficiency of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

each Consular officer. A system has been devised which will enable the Secretary of State to learn at a glance all that any formal record can show respecting a man's capacity, fitness, character and adaptability for his work and for the particular post he holds. This efficiency record is to be most carefully and systematically kept, and when it has been developed and improved by experience it will be one of the most useful instruments for the improvement of the service that have yet been devised.

In order to give additional value to the efficiency record which Secretary Root is striving so earnestly to create, it will be incumbent upon Congress to provide for the corps of Consular Inspectors, referred to, for it is not possible to arrive at a just and comprehensive estimate of the work, character and capacity of a Consular officer, if such estimate has to rest wholly upon the written records of his work and upon the perusal of his formal communications to the Department of State.

The efficiency of Consular officials cannot be fully and fairly determined through the medium of official reports, unless some substantial change in the organization of the system is authorized by Congress. There are at present about sixty Consuls-General in the service. It ought to be the duty of a Consul-General frequently to inspect Consular offices under his jurisdiction, and to make intelligent and discriminating reports concerning the conduct of every office he visits.

Under the present system the official connection between the Consuls-General and the Consular officers of lower grade is of a loose, perfunctory and formal character. Very often the Consul-General does not know the Consuls in his jurisdiction, and never visits them officially. One reason for this is that the Consuls-General in the larger cities, under the present organization, are so occupied with the duties of their own offices that they have little time for travel and inspection. Another reason is that there are no funds provided to enable them to do this much-needed work. The value of these visits, as the service is now organized, might in many cases be open to grave conjecture. It has frequently happened that men without any experience whatever are made Consuls-General, and it could hardly be expected that an official of this sort who does not know the rudiments of Consular bookkeeping would make a competent Inspector. When the service is properly organized, a man will not reach the grade

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Consul-General until he has served a good many years in a subordinate capacity, and when he is appointed Consul-General it will be fair to assume that he is fitted for that office.

The Lodge Bill has been reported to and passed by the Senate in an amended form. The most important of the amendments made by the Committee before reporting the bill to the Senate are those which strike out the sections providing for a system of promotion in the Consular Service, and the sections relating to the age of appointees, and their examination for admission to the service. It is earnestly to be hoped that when the House debates this bill the wisdom of restoring at least the former of these provisions will be demonstrated. There should be a carefully worked out and ordered plan of promotion. The clause placing limitations upon the age of appointees to the Consular Service should be restored to the Lodge Bill. The matter of examinations is not from a practical view so important a feature of the bill as the other points, for the reason that the President can continue to require every applicant to pass a satisfactory examination. This is an attribute of the power of appointment conferred upon him by the Constitution.

The Lodge Bill ought not to encounter serious opposition in the House of Representatives. The Hon. Robert Adams, of Pennsylvania, has been for many years an outspoken and tireless advocate of Consular reform, and as he is now second in rank on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs effective support for the cause will be expected of him.

It is not proposed at present to bring the Consular Corps within the scope of the Civil Service law, but merely to reorganize it upon lines which will make for greater permanence of tenure and vastly improved efficiency. If Congress will give to the President and Secretary of State power to grade the Consular Service, and to appoint men to a class or grade rather than to a particular post, and will, also, authorize the adjustment of salaries and make them adequate, and, furthermore, empower the President to shift men about from post to post, as the needs of the Service demand, it will be the most important, far-reaching, and substantial advance in respect to the improvement of the Consular Service that has ever been made, an advance from which there will be no retreat, and which will in itself be an unfailing and certain incentive to further and more radical changes for the better.

FRANCIS B. LOOMIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAUSE OF THE RECENT MONEY STRINGENCY.

BY A. B. HEPBURN, PRESIDENT OF THE CHASE NATIONAL BANK, NEW YORK; FORMERLY COMPTROLLER OF THE UNITED STATES CURRENCY.

FROM November 1st to January 5th, the rates for call-money in New York City ranged from 5 per cent. to 125 per cent. *per annum*. In speculating as to the cause of such abnormally high rates, it has been generally assumed to be the fault of our currency system, superadded to the evils of our Sub-Treasury system. Hardly any one will undertake to defend our Sub-Treasury system, under which the Government's revenues absorb money in circulation and impound the same in the Treasury until it goes out in pursuance of Congressional appropriation to liquidate a Government debt; but, with the Government's disbursements exceeding its revenues, as has been the case for the past year, some other cause than the Sub-Treasury system must be found for the money stringency. Was our currency system at fault, and wherein? The total stock of money in the country on January 1st, 1900, was $2,253,133,438, and on January 1st, 1906, $2,992,758,207. Excluding the money in the United States Treasury we had a total amount in actual use in 1900 of $1,980,398,170, and in 1905 of $2,671,543,571. During the period of these high rates of interest, there was $691,000,000 more money in circulation and use than in the corresponding period in 1900, an increase of nearly 35 per cent. The *per capita* of money in actual circulation increased during the same period from $26.36 to $31.81. This would seem to be a degree of currency expansion more than commensurate with the growth in population and business development.

In addition to gold and silver, our currency consists of (1)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Treasury notes, commonly called "legal tenders"; (2) notes issued by National Banks, and (3) certificates issued by the Government upon either gold or silver. Title to this currency passes by delivery, and it consummates the smaller business transactions, serves the convenience of travellers, pin-money, pastime and petty affairs generally.

There is another kind of currency, the title to which passes by endorsement, the magnitude and importance of which are not generally appreciated. The business of banking consists in swapping well-known credit for less-known credit. *A* goes to his bank with his note, which the bank knows to be good, and which it accepts and discounts, and it gives *A* in exchange therefor a better-known credit, which he can use in the transaction of his business; it may be money, or it may be the bank's check, certificate of deposit, or the bank's draft upon some distant or foreign city where *A* wishes to command funds. Ease, convenience, economy and safety have built up a system of transmission of funds from one place to another, from one country to another, by means of checks and drafts, only the balance of exchange or trade being settled by money shipped by mail, express or steamer. These checks or drafts are generally used to make payment of indebtedness, and are commonly and properly characterized as "auxiliary currency." Let me illustrate the extent to which they are used: The amount of such checks and drafts collected through the New York Clearing-House in 1900 was $51,964,588,564, and in 1905 the unprecedented total of $93,822,060,201, being an increase in five years of 78 per cent. The increase is simply marvellous, and in view of this fact it is difficult to argue that our "auxiliary currency" has not responded in full measure to the growing demands of trade and commerce. Let me describe the practical working of the Clearing-House: Each member of the Associated Banks presents to the Clearing-House, at ten o'clock each morning, all the items (called "exchanges") it has, payable at the counters of all the other banks of the City, and receives credit from the Clearing-House for the total amount so presented. *Per contra,* each bank is charged with all the items which all the other banks present against it. If the amount of exchanges charged against a bank exceeds the amount of exchanges which it brought to the Clearing-House, then the bank is debit, and must pay to the Clearing-House the debit balance in cash, and receives

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cash from the Clearing-House in case it is credit. The debits and credits must, of course, equal each other. Under the Clearing-House system, the balances only are paid in cash, and in collecting $93,822,060,201 only $3,963,546,049 in actual money was used. This enormous volume of business was done with the use of only .0422 per cent. in cash.

Statistics show that 90 per cent. of all the business consummated through banks is done by means of checks and drafts. This auxiliary currency possesses perfect elasticity, expands and contracts without let or hindrance, tax or supervision, and responds to the demands of trade completely and perfectly. It has certainly expanded to meet the demands of trade during the period under discussion. The only thing this auxiliary currency cowers before is distrust, and it necessarily contracts when credit is curtailed. Optimism, and not distrust, has prevailed for several years past. Our currency, which at best does less than 10 per cent. of the business of the country, is blamed for these abnormally high rates, and Congress is appealed to for legislative remedy. It is difficult to see how our currency (consummating less than 10 per cent. of the business of the country) could be given sufficient elasticity to prevent a stringency in time of distrust or under conditions recently prevailing. With our currency larger in volume and *per capita* than ever before, with universal optimism prevailing and our bank credits phenomenal in amount, are we not forced to acquit our currency system and seek elsewhere for the cause of recent high money rates? The present is not the first occasion when our currency has been unjustly accused. The Far West and Southwest, surrounded by latent wealth, requiring only development to convert the same into actual tangible wealth, clamored for more currency, thinking that if the volume were increased it would somehow inure to their advantage. What they needed was more capital; what they thought they needed was more currency. It seems to me that lack of floating capital was responsible for the high interest rates recently prevailing.

For a series of years we have been blessed with good crops and good prices; we have prospered and accumulated wealth, but not in volume equal to the demands which the expansion of old, as well as the development of new, enterprises has made. The building operations for which permits were granted in twenty-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

six of the larger cities, in 1904, amounted to $375,571,130 and, in 1905, to $528,186,412. These figures indicate the demand made upon capital by the building industries throughout the country. Such investments are permanent, the iron and steel that enter into the construction being almost as much buried as they were in the original ore.

From 1900 to 1905 railroad mileage increased 27,000 miles; railroad capital stock increased $796,000,000, and floating debts increased $2,013,000,000. The railroad capitalization, including stock and indebtedness, increased from $62,000 to $67,000 per mile. The figures shown in the following table are significant:

NEW SECURITIES LISTED ON THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, 1900–1905 INCLUSIVE, (EXPRESSED IN MILLIONS).

	Bonds.	*Stocks.*	*Both.*
Gross	3,996	4,183	8,179
Replacing, etc.	2,240	2,786	5,026
New	1,756	1,397	3,153

The average price of the stocks of sixty railroads sold on the Stock Exchange in 1900 was $69 per share, and of the same railroads, in 1905, the average price was $117.90. The average price of twelve industrials in 1900 was $68.10 and in 1905 $95. The average price of all shares sold on the New York Stock Exchange in 1900 was $69.20, and in 1905 $87.30.

While these figures emphasize the growth and prosperity of the country, they also emphasize the coincident demand for investment capital.

The increased price of stocks makes no increased demand upon capital as long as the ownership is unchanged, and it may be argued that, when stocks are sold at an advanced price, the larger sum received is by the recipient put into general use, so that no additional demand is made upon capital. Nevertheless, an advance in price in an active article of trade does make a greater demand upon both capital and currency. What is true of railroads as to advancing prices is, in fuller measure, true of iron and steel and the corporations controlling them. In fact, all property, corporate and real, has been subjected to the same influence and similar experience as to advance in values. Then, too, we have invested a considerable amount of money in other countries. During 1905, there were placed in New York bonds of Japan, Cuba and Mexico, Canada Northern 4s and London Underground notes, amounting to $281,367,000. Mexican rails

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are largely owned in the United States, not to mention other foreign investments. Mr. Boissevain, a distinguished economist of Amsterdam, states that Europe has loaned to the recent combatants, Russia and Japan, over $1,000,000,000 since the beginning of their war, and it is estimated that the loss by destruction of property and values exceeds $1,000,000,000. Here, indeed, a sad inroad was made upon capital, both for actual use in the prosecution of the war and by means of destruction as a result of the war. Europe, barring Russia, has been generally prosperous and has experienced in a degree the same impetus which has given unprecedented volume to business in America. The same influences and the same results which have obtained in America have measurably obtained in Europe. Money reached 6 per cent. in London and 10 and 12 per cent. in Berlin; and it was not, therefore, as easy to utilize our credit abroad as in ordinary conditions. Europe had troubles of her own; the condition in Russia hung like a pall over the business and financial world; and, instead of loaning her funds, she was inclined to husband them. Notwithstanding these general conditions and the great business activity which comprehended every part of the country, the interest rates in Chicago, St. Louis, St. Paul and Minneapolis, and, in fact, throughout the whole interior, did not exceed the normal rate, and all business demands were fully supplied. Six per cent. prevailed in Philadelphia and Boston until near the end of the stringency, and at all times and everywhere, including New York, all business interests were fully supplied at a rate not exceeding 6 per cent. All merchants and manufacturers in New York, enjoying good credit, were fully supplied at from 5 to 6 per cent.

Who paid these high rates for money? Speculative interests, believing that the great degree of prosperity portended and justified an advance of prices, saw fit to advance, day by day, the price of many listed securities. In many stocks, the advance was as much as twenty-five points, and was accomplished in the face of most adverse money conditions, when capital, in Europe as well as in America, was under a strain. The speculative interests paid these high rates, and, had they been content to leave the market as it was, without advancing prices until after the crop-moving demand had been cared for, money rates would hardly have reached an abnormally high figure.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who received these high rates of interest? It is estimated that $70,000,000 of European funds came to New York during the stringency, attracted by the high interest rates. It was capital in the form of credit which Europe sent, not currency. This European capital protected the situation and averted the alternative solution,—liquidation in the stock-market and curtailment of business. Remember that currency is the "small change" of business; its greatest function is to settle balances; the great bulk of business is consummated by bank credits, which represent capital,—that is, capital upon which the credit is predicated. I wish to combat the popular fallacy of confounding capital and currency, but pass that for a moment. If our currency furnishes ample funds to supply all parts of the country at reasonable rates—except Wall Street—we need not "lie awake nights worrying" over its condition. In the past five years, money in actual use has increased on an average of $138,200,000 a year. During the same period, the use of bank credits (checks and drafts, "auxiliary currency") has increased 67 per cent. The financial horizon has been without a cloud and credit untrammelled. It seems to me that a candid survey of the situation must absolve our currency system from responsibility for the high rates of interest which obtained in New York and in New York alone. The cause was over-trading. Speculation is not confined to the Stock Exchange, the Cotton Exchange and the Wheat Pit. Every locality has its form of adventure, and the forms are almost as varied as the different forms of property. The whole country has been expanding, developing, speculating. The Walsh episode in Chicago, which carried down three banks in its wake, is an extreme illustration. The growth of business generally is expressed by the fact that bank clearings outside of New York increased from $33,500,000,000 in 1900 to $50,100,000,000 in 1905. While we have grown rich rapidly of late, nevertheless the growth of business has required added capital in volume exceeding our increased wealth, and the recent financial flurry was more a question of capital than of currency.

Our currency system is most unscientific and by no means perfect, yet it seems to expand with ample facility. Mother Earth gives us of gold $80,000,000 annually. The greatest danger lies, I think, in the inability of our currency to respond to conditions in time of panic. Panic is business paralysis; it can only be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liquidated by keeping the wheels of industry moving, placing our products in the marts which await them and realizing payment therefor. Panic means loss of business sense on the part of the community. There should be some lawful currency available for temporary use, in order to prevent the stoppage of business while reflection and deliberation are bringing back confidence. Clearing-House certificates are no longer available, for many reasons. They amount to a suspension, as between banks, of currency payments, and would excite more alarm than they would allay. They would divert more funds from the city using them than the volume of such certificates which could be used would amount to.

I like the recommendation of Secretary Shaw as to an emergency currency; it is predicated upon the law and experience of Germany, and is safe and conservative. Secretary Shaw's recommendation permits banks, having a circulation secured by Government bonds, to issue unsecured circulation to an amount equal to 50 per cent. of their secured circulation. The additional amount so issued would be a prior lien upon the assets of the banks. The Government would be bound to redeem the same upon presentation, and the banks receiving such circulation would pay a tax at the rate of 5 per cent. *per annum* thereupon. Such circulation would be good beyond question. Statistics since the creation of the National Banking system, show that an annual tax of one-fourth of one per cent. upon the outstanding circulation of the banks would have raised a fund more than sufficient to have redeemed every note of every bank that has failed, independent of the Government bonds which secured them. The large tax would be profitable to the Government, and would constrain the banks not to take out such circulation unless necessity therefor existed. This plan is a slight departure from the present currency system; it would enable currency to expand in an emergency, and would also provide the other element of elasticity, "contraction," by imposing so heavy a tax that the issue would naturally and necessarily be redeemed as soon as the emergency had passed.

A. B. HEPBURN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A RURAL VIEW OF RURAL FREE DELIVERY.

BY EGBERT T. BUSH.

THE article entitled "The Why of Rural Free Delivery," published in the December number of this REVIEW, can hardly have failed to interest thousands of people. The importance of the subject and the undeniable ability with which the author handles it attract and hold the reader. While many of us will take issue with him both on his premises and on his conclusions, much that he says in the language and manner of an able advocate is worthy of serious consideration. But, if the force of an article is ever weakened by manifest special pleading, then the most ardent admirers of that scholarly production must concede that it carries within itself no small amount of the element of weakness. And it may well be that this article, called into being by a careful perusal of that, will fall more or less under the same condemnation.

With the author's evident hatred of jobbery and fraud, every honest citizen is in hearty accord; but it does not follow that every such citizen must agree with his view of this important subject. There are, in fact, millions of honest citizens who have learned that the cry of "Jobbery!" so easily raised and so convenient on numberless occasions, does not always carry with it the proof of jobbery. They have learned that the special pleader in opposition to any measure, no matter how meritorious, is under great temptation to raise that cry as the quickest and easiest way to arrest attention. They are not unmindful that the "practical politician," having learned its magic power, often raises that virtuous cry for purposes of his own. They have seen him calmly gathering in the fruits of his groundless charge before the falsehood could be exposed. It is not in this spirit that the author of "The Why" hurls his condemnations. His motives

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are most commendable; but there is no patent pending for the discovery that one may err with the best of intentions.

The scientific biography of what General Hawkins calls "this new creation in the interests of partisan power, . . . this later addition to our family of postal abuses," begins thus: "The time of its conception in the womb of practical politics was the last half of the year 1896." However desirable it may be, analytical biography rarely begins at that point; besides, there are those who, knowing something of both its history and its parentage, will contend that, whoever or whatever may have adopted it since its birth, Rural Free Delivery was never conceived in the womb of practical politics. It is well known that the rural people themselves, the tillers of the soil, hard-handed and hard-headed people as they are, first made the appeal for Rural Free Delivery. Seeing their city cousins enjoying free delivery at the door several times a day, these rural toilers began to wonder why they should not, to some extent, share in a service for which they were helping to pay. Their reasoning may have been defective, but they could not see why ten thousand people crowded together on a square mile, all of whom could reach the post-office by a short walk on pavement, should be served at their homes at public expense, while the toilers in the fields within a radius of two or three miles, with the rural post-office as a centre, were compelled either to serve themselves or do without their mail. They began to grow restless, to agitate the matter among themselves, even to ask aloud why some plan could not be devised by which at least the more densely populated rural sections might be served. From neighborly discussion they carried the question into their local Granges—the last place in the world for practical politics.

In 1891, Mr. Mortimer Whitehead, a prominent Granger of New Jersey, introduced the subject into the National Grange. In the winter of 1891-2, as a farmer and in behalf of farmers, he made the first argument for Rural Free Delivery before a committee of Congress, and succeeded in getting a small appropriation for experimental work. Here, then, was the beginning of "this new creation in the interests of partisan power." And it is safe to say that, unless the anatomy of the body politic has all along been wholly misunderstood, "the womb of practical politics" is not located in the region of the Grange.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is a great mistake to say that "this was a luxury which the rural citizen had never dreamed of." The truth is, he had been dreaming for years—dreaming much of the time with faint hope of ever seeing his dreams realized, but dreaming none the less fondly on that account. To the personal knowledge of the writer, this matter was discussed in the rural press long before the date given as the "time of its conception in the womb of practical politics." In his own humble way, he published editorials in favor of some system of rural delivery, and did so without one thought that he was working in the interests of partisan politics.

We are told that, in many instances, "the sturdy citizens of the rural districts rebelled against its infliction." This seems to be a sad case, or, rather, a statement of many sad cases. That the Government should, as alleged, actually force upon a helpless community a service against which its citizens rebelled certainly smacks of tyranny in aggravated form. That a man's mail should be left daily at his door, when he prefers to go for it himself; that he should thus be deprived of the "excuse for going to the village for the mail," when possibly so much of his happiness depends upon that excuse,—seems to be nothing short of trampling upon the sacred rights of citizenship. That the boys and girls should be thus deprived of an excuse for an "enjoyable ride on the bicycle when the day's work was over," strikes one as a ruthless crushing of the young, no less than of the old, "in the interests of partisan power."

We read further: "The dissatisfaction is not confined to any particular class, but is shared by all the people who go to make up the usual rural communities. . . . They have missed the familiar old stage with its accommodating driver. . . . The boys and girls had ridden with him to school for generations." Yet on the back of this dark picture we find written: "So attractive had it become in its fifth year that many an honest citizen fell then who had never fallen before, and became an ardent advocate of this new state industry."

To say the least, there seem to be some incongruities here. If the rural people, not any particular class, but all classes, resent the imposition of Rural Free Delivery, how can it become so attractive to them? All who understand this matter know that routes are never granted, or imposed, without the asking; that it takes one hundred petitioners, heads of families, to secure

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consideration of a proposed route twenty-four miles long. What then? Are we to infer that this insidious scheme has, through some occult power, become "so attractive" that people are actually hypnotized into asking for what they do not want? Are we to believe that, under some mysterious spell, from ninety to ninety-five per cent. of the people on a proposed route are wheedled into petitioning the Department to enforce upon them a service against which all classes rebel?

But the dear old stage—ah, yes! In the days of its glory, comparatively few people saw anything of it, and far fewer ever derived from it either benefit or satisfaction. "The familiar old stage" always took the direct road between two offices, becoming familiar enough to the few people along that short cut, but leaving all the numerous "back roads," often far more important thoroughfares, to get along as best they could without its benefactions. These neglected highways are now traversed by the Rural Free Delivery wagon, and the people who never saw "the old familiar stage," without seeking its route, are now served daily at their homes. If any of them are lamenting the late departed, the echo of their wail has failed to reach this locality. It is true that the old stage did sometimes carry passengers for hire; but its service in carrying children to school must have been very slight indeed. After thirty years of close association with old-time routes and country schools, the writer cannot recall a single instance in which a child was carried to school by the "accommodating driver." And very good reasons there are for this lack of service to the boys and girls. The stage rarely runs at the hour for going to school; besides, the driver would have to be very accommodating, indeed, to make that service of any particular value. Farmers' children have few dimes to spend for rides to school, and free transportation by the mail-coach—never heard of in this vicinity—must be either insignificant to the community or ruinous to the driver.

The practical politician and the quiet citizen who knows not the ways of politics will be equally puzzled to see how so glaring an "injustice," imposed in spite of protest upon a helpless rural community, can be made an element of strength to the party responsible for the outrage. If the matter is half as bad as "The Why" paints it, how can it fail so to arouse the anger of the outraged citizens as to become an element of great weakness? One

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would think that, for every vote gained by subsidizing the carrier—if, indeed, there is any such possible gain—at least a dozen would be lost. To assume that such glaring wrongs would be allowed to go unrebuked, that partisan advantage can be gained by heaping indignities upon the people, is not only to discredit American manhood and American fitness for self-government, but to deny all the teachings of political history.

That now and then a man, even in the rural communities, should object to this new service was to be expected: first, because there must always be objectors to everything new; secondly, because a very small percentage of the people on every such route may be no better served than before, and possibly not so well. The man whose home is within three or four hundred yards of the wayside post-office does not feel the need of rural delivery. To him it is a needless and uncalled-for innovation. Besides, that office is kept by his good neighbor, who sells kerosene and a few other household necessities, and who "comes in handy" in various matters of local interest. It would be very strange if, now and then, one such rural citizen could not be induced to enter a protest against the "outrage," and even to write, or to father, diatribes against the enormity, for publication in the "local press." But such rural citizen, fortunately so situated that his mail is already brought practically to his door, is not favorably situated for voicing the sentiment of the community as a whole, much less that of the farmer who must travel three miles for his mail. Close observation of this matter of Rural Free Delivery, and personal contact with the people on various routes, have convinced the writer that what was to be expected actually is; that opposition to any proposed route is one of the things to be encountered, and that the opposition always comes from the immediate village or hamlet whose post-office is likely to be discontinued or adversely affected. This is only human nature with the gloss rubbed off. The people near the office are already well served; why should they favor any change? The postmaster not only wants the slight emoluments of the office, but he wants the farmers for miles around, the farther the better, forced into his store for their mail. There is money in it for him—daily droppings that might otherwise go elsewhere. Naturally enough, he can sway the sympathies of his near neighbors, who have nothing to lose by accommodating him; but the farmers out on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the route, from a half mile to three miles away, look upon it from a different point of view, and arrive at a very different conclusion.

It will hardly seem unfair to take for example a route recently established here in one of the counties of New Jersey, with which the writer is familiar. When it was proposed, every one knew that it would do away with two small offices. The postmaster at one hamlet kept no shop of any kind, and was very anxious to be relieved of his unremunerative responsibility. Instead of working up a sentiment against the change, he worked for it, and he and every one of his immediate neighbors signed the petition. The other postmaster did keep a little store. He was strongly opposed to the change; but, as he was in a measure caught napping, almost all of his neighbors signed the petition. A few weeks later, several of those who had signed were somehow induced to be equally accommodating with their signatures when a remonstrance was presented; but it should be borne in mind that here, as perhaps everywhere, the remonstrants all lived within easy reach of the post-office. Of the more remote petitioners, not one saw or to this day has been able to see, a new light. The route has now been in operation several months; and if there is one patron, not counting the ex-postmaster and his little clique of three or four, who is not well pleased with the service, all signs of such dissatisfaction are carefully concealed. And yet it might not be difficult for some interested party to induce one of those few to write or dictate a dismal wail over the wrong inflicted upon that helpless community. Now, in all fairness, may we not suppose that similar conditions prevail generally throughout the rural districts? Are we not justified in believing that, so far as these so-called "rural complaints" are concerned, it is the village against the farming community? Is there anything unreasonable or ungenerous in feeling that those rural citizens who lament the good old way are the very ones who, having been well served themselves, forget that people less favorably situated have equal needs, and possibly equal rights?

But we are assured that the village post-office had always been near at hand. That depends largely upon what is meant by "near." In a petition before me, the average distance for the entire number of signers is one and a half miles. That may seem "near" to people accustomed to paved streets and short

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hours and a mail-box at the next corner; not so to the farmer, whose toil ends not with the day, whose team is probably as weary as himself, and whose boy or girl is thought to be better off at home in the evening than out on the bicycle for that "enjoyable ride" after the day's work is done.

We are told, also, that the postal needs of the people "upon whom this service was forced" had always been few—"usually confined to the weekly paper and an average, in strictly rural parts, of not over one hundred letters and circulars for each family per year." This leads one to wonder what constitutes "strictly rural parts." With no large city near, with only ninety feet of trolley-line in the county and with the post-office, in a town of five or six hundred inhabitants, two miles away, these had always seemed to be rural parts. But, according to the conditions laid down by our author, we are so far removed from the rural that we cannot tell where we are. If we take a tier of farms beginning a half mile from our post-office and extending to two and a half miles, the limit of service in this direction under the old system, we find that, of the nine farmers, five regularly take a daily paper. We find, also, that the lowest number of pieces of mail received per year by any one of these families is several hundred, while the highest reaches about three thousand. If this is not an average, neither is it exceptional in communities served by Rural Free Delivery; and it shows that the postal needs of such communities are far from being so few as many well-meaning people have been led to believe. It shows, too, what every one should begin to understand by this time—that the farmer of to-day is not the illiterate, non-reading, non-writing lout that some delight to paint and others would be glad to have him.

"A very large majority of the tax-producers," says General Hawkins, "are being compelled to pay about four dollars for every one earned by Rural Free Delivery, for an uncalled-for and unnecessary service in which it is impossible that they should have the slightest interest." This looks like a serious indictment; but, when we come to analyze the postal system, Rural Free Delivery does not seem so great a criminal after all. The postal service never has been, and perhaps never can be, strictly just. Somebody is constantly paying for what he does not get, and somebody is constantly getting what he does not pay for.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The inequality comes about in various ways. One man may carry his hundreds of letters a year three miles to the post-office, and look daily after his own mail or go without it; while another drops his few score letters into the box at the next corner, and has his mail delivered at his door. The cancellations of the one may be ten times those of the other, but the conveniences are all for the man who pays the little. The countryman is paying for what he does not get, while his city cousin is getting what he does not pay for.

We are sometimes told that the man in the city is entitled to better service, because he uses the mails so much more than the man in the country; but this conclusion is based on an assumption which it might be very hard to prove. While it is true that the city offices make a very fine showing on receipts and expenditures, it is doubtful whether the average citizen of the town, excluding those connected with houses that do business with country people, uses the mails as much as the average countryman; and it is certainly fair to exclude all business upon which country people, either directly or indirectly, pay the postage. We have been rather sneeringly told by one opponent of rural service that a single seed-house in Philadelphia pays more postage than a whole county in New Jersey. We have access to only one side of the comparison, and cannot prove it false or true. But let us concede its truth. What of it? How is it made possible for that house to pay so much? With whom does it do that extensive business? Chiefly with those rural people whose postal needs are said to be few—"usually confined to the weekly paper," etc. Who is it, then, that actually pays these thousands annually handed over to the Government by that house? Do not its patrons foot the bills? Are not these thousands and thousands of country people paying the postage on every pound and ounce and packet of seed sent out by mail? Are they not also paying, through the increased price of seeds, the postage on every catalogue? It is folly to say that the dealer pays the postage. As well say that the importer pays the duty! He does not, and he cannot. All expenses must necessarily come out of the last purchaser, the consumer of the goods. Any other supposition is at variance with an irrepealable law of trade. Then, while we should not grudge that house its mail facilities, we may properly insist that the toiler out in the country, far though he be from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the great centre of business, the man whose toil and whose "scanty needs" make possible much of that central activity, shall not be wholly overlooked. While we rejoice in the great store and the busy shop, it is well for all to remember that the roots of every industry run far out into the soil.

But, since the countryman is not paying directly into the postal revenues the full cost of rural service, it is hard for many to understand how it can be that he is not getting more than his share; or, in the language of our critic, that somebody is not compelled to pay "for a service in which it is impossible that he should have the slightest interest." Might not the same objection be raised against other services—any service? Few men are broad enough to look upon the people as a whole; and, from any other point of view, can any one be said to be interested in every branch of the public service? Is it not true that, by the same narrow rule, for more than forty years country people have been helping to pay for a service—City Free Delivery—in which they have not the slightest interest? There are no records to show that, when that service was established in 1863, the country people made any serious outcry, or denounced its origin as "the womb of practical politics." But it can hardly be denied that they had greater cause to protest then than city people have now. These are already enjoying the service, and a few of them —not many, let us hope—are grudging its extension to their country cousins. At that time, the country people had not the slightest prospect of such extension; and yet, as "tax producers," they were compelled to help pay the bills. And, surely, if rural service is open to the objection of being or becoming a possible factor in partisan politics, city service was, and still is, open to the same objection.

On July 1st, 1905, there were 32,055 rural routes in operation, and 21,788 city carriers in the service. The cost of the two branches was about the same, each a trifle under $21,000,000. The rural routes served 12,213,000 patrons, no application for a rural route being allowed to count any children under sixteen years of age. The cities covered by the Free Delivery service aggregate, according to the last census, almost 28,000,000, counting all ages and conditions. The rural service counts nobody within a half mile of the post-office, all within that distance being, as the agents phrase it, "too handy by to be considered." If

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we exclude a circle of a half-mile radius around every city post-office, we shall have almost nine hundred square miles of solid city, whose millions of people must, in all fairness, be excluded from the comparison.

The one and only reasonable objection to Rural Free Delivery is its cost. But, in reckoning this, there is one feature generally overlooked. There are two items that materially reduce the apparent cost: first, the discontinuance of star routes; secondly, the greater revenue derived by throwing the cancellations into the larger offices, from which the Department gets a much larger share. Whatever is saved by either of these means is properly to be credited to Rural Free Delivery.

Two routes have been granted to start from a certain office. The first, now in operation, saves $110 annually on star-route and messenger service, besides taking up the cancellations of two offices from which the Government derived no revenue. Besides making one office unnecessary, the second route will take up one star route, thus entitling itself to a credit of approximately one-fourth its cost. Taking these two sources of saving, it is probably a fair estimate that the rural routes of the country should be credited with twenty-five per cent. of the debtor side. This would reduce the actual cost of the service to about $16,000,000, and, after all fair eliminations have been made, show the country service to be little more expensive, million for million of actual patrons, than the city service.

Free delivery was first established in twenty-seven cities. The service has grown steadily—grown by its own merits, as we believe—until now it embraces between eleven and twelve hundred. Its birth was a boon. Its adoption was a step in the right direction, the direction of giving the people the most convenient service that circumstances would allow. Rural Free Delivery is not a new creature, of strange and abhorrent parentage; it is only a natural development of what was born of Progress more than forty years ago.

EGBERT T. BUSH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS THE UNITED STATES PREPARED FOR WAR?—II.

BY FREDERIC LOUIS HUIDEKOPER.

WHEN the progressive American business man, firm, company or corporation desires to have affairs properly conducted, one rule is invariably observed, viz., men specially trained for that particular business are employed in numbers proportioned to its requirements under any and all circumstances. We all sympathize with the Israelites who had to make bricks without straw; but, in some respects, Pharaoh was no harder taskmaster than Congress has been, inasmuch as the Army is supposed to be able to cope with every possible emergency, although the requisite strength has yet to be given it. *Never at the beginning of any decade in our national history, save one, have our people had as many as one trained soldier to every one thousand of population to protect them,* as will appear from the following illuminating table:

Year.	Population of the United States.	Actual strength of the Regular Army.	Number of soldiers per 1,000 of population.
1790	3,929,214	1,273	0.324
1800	5,308,483	4,436	0.833
1810	7,239,881	9,921	1.378
1820	9,633,822	8,942	0.927
1830	12,866,020	5,951	0.462
1840	17,069,453	10,570	0.602
1850	23,191,876	10,763	0.421
1860	31,443,321	16,367	0.520
1870	38,558,371	37,075	0.963
1880	50,155,783	26,509	0.527
1890	62,947,714	27,095	0.430
1900	76,303,387	68,155	0.895

When any individual or combination of individuals strives for the acquisition or control of a valuable business advantage or has any important negotiation to transact, the most experienced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and best trained of its officials or agents are invariably selected for the work. *Per contra,* Congress has persistently neglected its best trained forces in favor of comparatively raw and inexperienced soldiers; and, in time of crisis, it has never failed to place its main dependence on the latter. Since war is the severest test to which human forces can be subjected, the folly of this procedure has naturally been reiterated *ad nauseam.* That the Militia and Volunteers have never failed after two years of war—which afford ample time to transform them into well-trained soldiers—to acquit themselves with the utmost credit in no wise alters the fact that, until they have undergone some similar schooling, they have never been, and never will be, anything but comparatively raw, undisciplined organizations. This was clearly pointed out by Washington, who wrote to the President of Congress on September 24th, 1776, as follows:

"*To place any dependence upon militia is assuredly resting upon a broken staff.* Men just dragged from the tender scenes of domestic life, unaccustomed to the din of arms, totally unacquainted with every kind of military skill (which is followed by want of confidence in themselves when opposed by troops regularly trained, disciplined, and appointed, superior in knowledge and superior in arms), are timid and ready to fly from their own shadows.

"Besides, the sudden change in their manner of living, particularly in their lodging, brings on sickness in many, impatience in all, and such an unconquerable desire of returning to their respective homes, that it not only produces shameful and scandalous desertions among themselves, but infuses the like spirit in others. Again, men accustomed to unbounded freedom and no control cannot brook the restraint which is indispensably necessary to the good order and government of an army, without which licentiousness and every kind of disorder triumphantly reign. *To bring men to a proper degree of subordination is not the work of a day, a month, or even a year. . . . Certain I am that it would be cheaper to keep 50,000 or 100,000 in constant pay than to depend upon half the number and supply the other half occasionally by militia. The time the latter are in pay before and after they are in camp,* assembling and marching, *the waste of ammunition, the consumption of stores, which, in spite of every resolution or requisition of Congress, they must be furnished with or sent home, added to other incidental expenses consequent upon their coming and conduct in camp, surpass all idea and destroy every kind of regularity and economy which you could establish among fixed and settled troops,* and will, in my opinion, prove, if the scheme is adhered to, the ruin of our cause."

Although it would be manifestly unjust to blame the Militia for their ignorance, when our laws have never provided them

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the requisite military training, and although we must not withhold the praise which they have always richly merited whenever, as Volunteers, they have at last received sufficient schooling in actual warfare, yet it must be confessed that, as a purely military asset, their value has fallen far short of what it ought to have been, and that their history has fully justified Washington's estimate, as the following exhibits will demonstrate.

MILITIA RAN AWAY OR DESERTED.

Battle.	Date.	Organization or Expedition.
Long Island	August 27th, 1776	Parsons' brigade.[1]
Evacuation of New York.	Sept. 15th, 1776	Brigades of Parsons and Fellows.[2]
Brandywine	Sept. 11th, 1777	Sullivan's division.[3]
Camden, S. C.	Aug. 16th, 1780	Virginia and South Carolina brigades.[4]
Guilford Court House, N. C.	March 15th, 1781	North Carolina regiment.[5]
Indian village near Fort Wayne, Ind.	Oct. 22nd, 1790	Harmar's Miami expedition.[6]
Darke County, Ohio	Nov. 4th, 1791	St. Clair's expedition.[7]
Frenchtown and Raisin River, Mich.	Jan. 18th–22nd, 1813	Winchester's column.[8]
Sackett's Harbor	May 29th, 1813	Gen. Brown's command.[9]
French Creek, N. Y.	Nov. 1st to 5th, 1813	Gen. Hampton's column.[10]
Chrystler's Field, Canada.	Nov. 11th, 1813	Gen. Wilkinson's column.[11]
Evacuation of Fort George, Niagara River.	Dec. 10th, 1813	Gen. McClure's N. Y. militia.[12]
Burning of Buffalo, and Black Rock, N. Y.	Dec. 30th, 1813	Gen. McClure's N. Y. militia.[13]
Bladensburg, Md.	Aug. 24th, 1814	Maryland, Virginia and District of Columbia Militia and Volunteers under Gen. Winder.[14]
New Orleans, La.	Jan. 8th, 1815	800 militia, under Gen. Morgan, posted on the west bank of the Mississippi.[15]
Lake Okeechobee, Fla.	Dec. 25th, 1837	Missouri volunteers and spies.[16]
Bull Run, Virginia.	July 21st, 1861	Gen. McDowell's entire force of militia.[17]

[1] Carrington, "Battles of the American Revolution," p, 209.—[2] Washington's letter to the President of Congress, Sept. 16th, 1776. Sparks, IV, p. 94.—[3] Greene's report; Sullivan's communication to Congress; Sparks, V, Appendix, p. 462; Carrington, pp. 370–380.—[4] Gen. Henry Lee, "Memoirs of the War in the Southern Department of the United States," I, pp. 178–183; Tarleton's "Campaign in North Carolina," pp. 106–109. In contrast to their comrades, the North-Carolinians of Dixon's regiment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MILITIA MUTINIED.

Place.	Date.	Mutineers.
Morristown, N. J.....	Jan. 1st, 1781	Pennsylvania Line (6 regiments) 1,300 men.
Pompton, N. J.....	Jan. 24th–28th, 1781	New Jersey Line.[19]
Lancaster, Pa.....	June, 1783	80 recruits, joined by 200 other malcontents, marched to Philadelphia, demanded their pay and held Congress prisoner for several hours on June 21st, 1783.[20]
On the march from Urbana, Ohio, to Detroit, Mich.....	June, 1812	General Hull's militia.[21]
Detroit, Mich.....	July, 1812	180 Ohio Militia of Hull's command.[22]
On the march from Fort Harrison, Ind., to the Wabash and Illinois Rivers.....	Oct. 19th, 1812	4,000 Kentucky mounted militia under General Hopkins.[23]
En route to the rapids of the Maumee River.....	Oct., 1812	Kentucky, Virginia and Ohio Militia under Gen. W. H. Harrison.[24]
En route from Plattsburg, N. Y., to Canada.....	Nov., 1812	Nearly all the 3,000 militia under General Dearborn.[25]
Battle of Queenstown....	Oct. 13th, 1813	New York Militia under Generals Van Rensselaer and Wadsworth.[26]
Fort Strother, Fla.....	Nov., 1813	Tennessee Militia and Volunteers.[27]
Retreat to Buffalo after evacuation of Fort George.....	Dec., 1813	General McClure's New York Militia.[28]
Withlacoochee River, Fla.	Dec. 31st, 1835	Florida Militia and Volunteers under Gov. Call. Clinch's expedition.[29]
Charlestown, W. Va.....	July 16th–18th, 1861	Militia of the Army of the Shenandoah.[30]

greatly distinguished themselves.—[5] Carrington, 556–562.—[6] Report of the Court of Inquiry. Upton, p. 77.—[7] Report of the Investigating Committee of the House of Representatives.—[8] Upton, p. 109.—[9] Gen. Brown's Report to the Secretary of War; Fay's "American War," p. 102.—[10] Report of Col. Purdy, 4th New York Militia; American State Papers, I, p. 479.—[11] Upton, p. 113.—[12] Report of Gen. McClure to the Secretary of War; American State Papers, I, pp. 486–487.—[13] Letter of General Cass to the Secretary of War, Jan. 12th, 1814; American State Papers, I, p. 487.—[14] American State Papers, I, pp. 525–551; Armstrong's "Notices of the War of 1812," II, p. 152.—[15] Parton's "Life of Andrew

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STATES DEFY THE U. S. GOVERNMENT BY REFUSING TO FURNISH THEIR MILITIA TO ITS SERVICE.

State.	Governor.	Date.	Cause and reason for refusal.
Massachusetts..	Strong	April, 1812	Denied right of President or Congress to determine when such exigencies arise as to require calling out of militia. Claimed that "this right is vested in the commanders-in-chief of the militia of the several States."[31]
Connecticut....	Griswold	April, 1812	Substantially the same contention as the above.[32]
Vermont.....	Chittenden	Nov. 10th, 1813	Declared that "the military strength and resources of this State must be reserved for its own defence and protection exclusively."[33]
Vermont.....	Chittenden	Sept., 1814	Refused to order militia to support Gen. Macomb in repelling the enemy.[34]
Virginia	Letcher	April, 1861	Rebellion.
No. Carolina ...	Ellis		
Kentucky	Magoffin		
Tennessee.....	Harris		
Missouri.....	Jackson		
Arkansas	Rector		

Jackson," II, p. 213; Goodwin's "Life of Andrew Jackson," p. 153; Upton, pp. 135–136.—[16] Official Report of General Zachary Taylor; American State Papers, VII, pp. 987–988. *Per contra*, Barns's "Commonwealth of Missouri," p. 237.—[17] Official reports of Generals McDowell and Heintzelman; Moore's "Rebellion Record," II, pp. 6 and 26. The regulars alone retired in perfect order; Official Report of Major Sykes, p. 25.—[18] Sparks, VII, pp. 359–387; Fiske, "American Revolution," II, pp. 240–242; Carrington, pp. 537–538.—[19] Fiske, II, pp. 242–243; Upton, p. 56.—[20] "The Madison Papers," I, pp. 551–553; Sparks, VIII, pp. 455–456; Fiske, "Critical Period of American History," pp. 117–118.—[21] Hull's appeal to the public in his Memoirs, pp. 34–35.—[22] Hull's Memoirs. On Aug. 16th, 1812, Hull's entire garrison at Detroit surrendered to the British. How much value the enemy placed on the Militia is evinced by the fact that they were allowed to return home, whereas the 320 Regulars were sent to Montreal as prisoners.—[23] Upton, p. 99.—[24] *Ibid.* Harper's "Encyclopædia of U. S. History," IV, pp. 266-267.—[25] Ingersoll's "Second War," I, p. 101.—[26] Van Rensselaer's "Affair of Queenstown," p. 10 and Appendix, p. 62; Armstrong's "Notices of the War of 1812," II, pp. 100–107, and Appendix No. 12, pp. 207–219.—[27] Parton's "Life of Andrew Jackson," I, pp. 460–462. This furnished a very amusing incident; first, the Militia mutinied and were suppressed by the Volunteers; then, the Volunteers revolted and were brought to order by the Militia.—[28] Report of General McClure to the Secretary of War; American State Papers, I, pp. 486–487.—[29] Official Report of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is not the above a glorious record for Americans to contemplate?—Americans are so prone to boasting of the prowess of their citizen-soldiers. Yet these results are by no means surprising, in view of the utter lack of a definite military policy which has always characterized the measures of the legislators who frame our military laws and mould our military organizations. In every walk of life the value of skilled labor is fully recognized, and specially trained men are invariably selected in preference to unskilled. Yet Congress has never failed to place its main dependence upon the unskilled citizen-soldier. Every schoolboy knows that no enthusiasm, however great, will win athletic victories without long weeks and even months of careful training; our sages in the Capitol have shown that they believe that, because our people individually possess courage, fortitude and self-reliance in the highest degree, they must necessarily possess the same qualities when aggregated as soldiers. At certain periods —as, for example, that just prior to the first battle of Bull Run —the measures passed demonstrated that Congress actually believed that an army animated by patriotism needed neither instruction nor discipline to prepare it for war.

It is a well-known maxim in business that the efficiency of the management of every firm, bank, company or corpora-

Major-General Macomb, commanding the army, and Report of Gen. Call to the President, Jan. 9th, 1836; American State Papers, VI, p. 817, and VII, p. 218.—[30] General Patterson's Reports to the Adjutant-General; Report of the Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, III, pp. 126–127, 132, 138–139.—[31] Opinion delivered by Theophilus Parsons, Samuel Sewell and Isaac Parker, three judges of the Mass. Supreme Court; American State Papers, I, p. 324. Hart says ("Formation of the Union," p. 215) that "The general government had no means of enforcing its construction of the Constitution. It did, however, withdraw garrisons from the New England forts, leaving those States to defend themselves; and refused to send them their quota of the arms which were distributed among the States. This attitude was so well understood, that during the first few months of the war, English cruisers had orders not to capture vessels owned in New England. As the war advanced, these orders were withdrawn, and the territory of Massachusetts in the District of Maine was invaded by British troops. An urgent call for protection was then made upon the general government; but, even in this crisis, Massachusetts would not permit her militia to pass under the control of national military officers."—[32] Upton, p. 97. —[33] Ingersoll's "Second War," II, pp. 26–27; Hart, p. 215.—[34] Ingersoll, II, p. 133. It was not until 1827 that the question was finally adjudicated in the case of Martin *vs.* Mott, when the Supreme Court of the United States decided that it was reserved to the President alone to judge when the exigency arises in which he has the constitutional right to call out the militia, and that his decision was binding. Kent's Commentaries, I, p. 279.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion depends upon the capabilities of its officials. Inasmuch as the bulk of the troops which the United States has employed in time of war has always consisted of Militia and Volunteers, the officers of which, drawn from professional and mercantile pursuits, have of necessity had but little time or opportunity to master the multifarious details which ought to be familiar to every one whose duty it is to lead troops, is it surprising that their operations in war have been attended with mistakes which have often cost appallingly? Actuated by the highest motives, sacrificing their business and family interests for the purpose of serving their country, excelled by none in personal courage, these officers cannot justly be blamed for their ignorance; they are not responsible for the fact that they have never been provided with the education and training necessary to fit them to cope with the many difficult problems of war. No sound business corporation would dream for an instant of entrusting the management of its affairs to officials so comparatively inexperienced, and consequently so inferior, as the officers of the Militia and Volunteers.

It is for this very reason that the record of our land forces suffers sadly when compared with the record of our Navy, which has achieved an almost unbroken succession of splendid victories, from the days of John Paul Jones down to the present time. The education, training and *personnel* of the officers and men of the Navy being substantially on the same plane with those of their *confrères* in the Regular Army, the fundamental reason lies deeper. It rests in the fact that Congress has been wise enough to hold jealously to its constitutional right "to provide and maintain a navy," instead of delegating any part thereof to the various States and giving them the power to interfere in naval as they can in military affairs. Furthermore, the appointment of all naval officers is vested in the President alone, and not given to the Governors of the States, as in the case of the Militia and Volunteers. The consequence is that "the honor of our flag and the protection of the persons and property of our citizens have been entrusted to disciplined seamen, commanded by officers of professional training and experience." The merits of this system over that pursued in respect to the major part of our land forces need no commentary; the results speak for themselves.

War has never been anything more or less than a prize-fight between the armed forces of opposing nations, and every man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who has ever been in a fight of any sort knows the value of being able to deliver staggering blows at the outset. That incalculable advantage is conferred by the initiative in war, but that this advantage can never be maintained without a consistent course of action, supported by the requisite strength of one's armies in the field, was thoroughly taught by Napoleon, and the Japanese have been the last to demonstrate the soundness of his maxim. In order to attain these *desiderata,* the *sine qua non* always has been and always will be perfect readiness, and, other things being equal, victory has invariably attended the nation which was the more thoroughly prepared for war. Modern competition has assisted in hastening the crisis in every struggle, military, commercial or otherwise, and the first blow now follows so closely after the declaration of hostilities that no time is given for preparation, and even less for any careful study of plans for preparation. Hence it is that the nations of the world maintain military attachés and spies to watch the progress of military preparations elsewhere, in order that no other nation may be better prepared than themselves. The Scriptural parable anent the seven wise and seven foolish virgins is quite as applicable to modern armies as it was to the bridegroom of old.

Is the United States prepared to go to war with the military forces of the great nations in whose category we consider ourselves? We are reluctantly compelled to answer most positively, "No." The doubting Thomases will try to refute this reply by citing the fact that we possess a Regular Army numbering in time of war 100,000 troops excelled by none, and no less than 111,313 officers and men from the organized militia of the States which would serve as a second line. We retort: "Is this an adequate force? How efficient will this Militia be when called out as Volunteers?" Let us pause a moment to glance at the legislation enacted since the Spanish-American War.

Under the Act of March 2nd, 1899, United States Volunteers were organized for service in the Philippines. Captain Rhodes says:

"As Volunteer regiments, it has been the almost unanimous verdict that they have never been surpassed. Certainly never, in such a short space of time, have such excellent troops been organized, trained and put in the field.

"If the cause of this efficiency be analyzed, it will be found to have resulted from four factors:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"(1) *In most cases the field-officers of the regiments were selected from experienced officers of the regular service;* (2) *the company officers were principally selected by the War Department, from officers who had served creditably in State organizations during the war with Spain;* (3) *the fact that from this method of selection the officers were in no way under obligations to the men under them;* (4) *from careful selection of the enlisted personnel, accepting only the physically perfect, and after enlistment summarily discharging those deficient in the qualifications of a good soldier.*

"Under this Act of Congress, 1,524 officers and 33,050 men were enlisted, organized, equipped and instructed, and were on their way to their destination in less than six months from the date of passage of the law. They proved themselves a thoroughly reliable force in the Philippines, and it was largely through their aid that the Philippine insurrection was checked, and relapsed into guerrilla warfare."

Judged by the results obtained, this was a most admirable measure; but, unfortunately, it was limited to special conditions. On July 4th, 1902, the period of hostilities in the Philippines was officially announced to have terminated; the *raison d'être* for this force having ceased to exist, the regiments were subsequently brought back to the United States and mustered out, and the law ceased to be operative.

The next and last Congressional measure was "An Act to promote the efficiency of the Militia, and for other purposes," approved January 21st, 1903, and commonly known as "The Dick Bill." As originally introduced, it contained a number of admirable provisions; but, as in the past, it ended in a compromise measure containing some extremely glaring defects, which substantially defeated the very purpose for which the measure was framed. The merits and demerits of the bill may be summarized thus:

MERITS.

(1) Defines what citizens are liable to, and exempted from, military duty; (2) specifies the manner of calling out the Militia; (3) provides for the issuing of arms, ammunition and other military supplies by the United States Government; (4) provides for regular inspections of the Militia by army officers detailed by the Secretary of War; (5) provides that the Militia shall participate in joint manœuvres with the Regular Army; (6) provides for the pay and allowances of the Militia participating in encampments; (7) provides for Regular officers to be present at encampments of the Militia when requested by the Governor of that State; and (8) provides for the obtaining of a list of Militia officers who have had previous training in the Regular Army, the Volunteers or National Guard, and who, upon examination by boards

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Regular Army officers, have been found to possess the necessary qualifications which would fit them to hold commissions in the Volunteers.

DEMERITS.

(1) *Notwithstanding the lessons of the past as to the folly of short enlistments, the bill refuses to allow the Militia to be called out for more than nine months;* (2) future Volunteer regiments are to be organized according to the Act of April 22nd, 1898, thus again giving to the Governors of the various States the right to appoint the officers who are to be mustered into the service of, and receive their pay from, the United States Government; (3) appointments from the list of officers examined and found qualified to hold Volunteer commissions shall not include appointments in regiments of the organized Militia which volunteer as organizations, nor to their officers who are commissioned by the Governors of their State; (4) the original provision for the creation of a Volunteer Reserve of 100,000 men in time of peace, to which the qualified Militia officers were to be appointed, and for which the power of the Governors to make appointments in this corps had been wisely limited, was stricken out, and no provision was made for such a Volunteer Reserve, or even to keep alive the ridiculously inadequate force of 3,000 men authorized by the old Act of April 22nd, 1898.

As a result of the legislation of Congress since the Spanish-American War, the United States Government would have at its disposal in time of war:

(1) The Regular Army, with a maximum strength of 100,000 men; (2) the organized Militia, trained as a National Guard, and limited by the Constitution to service within the United States, for a period not to exceed nine months; (3) a Volunteer Reserve, composed of such Militia organizations as would volunteer for war in a body with all their officers and men; (4) regiments of State Volunteers, commanded by officers appointed by the Governors thereof.

The troops obtainable under the above classification would number:

(1) The Regular Army, 100,000. (2) The Organized Militia according to the latest reports numbered only 111,313. This force would furnish (3) the Volunteer Reserve. Although the Military Secretary has reported that seventy-five per cent. of the Organized Militia would respond to a call for volunteers, this estimate is purely conjectural, and our last war demonstrated conclusively that not more than forty per cent. thereof could be counted upon for such service. The Volunteer Reserve would, therefore, consist only of 44,525. (4) Regiments of State Volunteers would unquestionably be found in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volunteer Reserve. The number obtainable from this source is, accordingly, estimated as *nil.* Total number of troops upon which the United States could safely count for war is, consequently, only 144,525.

The *crux* of the entire question lies in the efficiency of the Militia or Volunteers, which can only be gauged by their training. All things considered, Pennsylvania possesses the best State Militia in the country, yet its actual training is confined to one week in camp and about seventy hours of drill and instruction during each calendar year; and, furthermore, there are no armories in the United States which permit the manœuvring of large bodies of troops such as are necessary in actual war. At the beginning of hostilities this Militia would furnish the best Volunteers that the United States could hope to obtain, and *how long does any reasonable man suppose that these troops, without additional training, would stand against the regulars of France or Germany? How much faith would the officials of any corporation place in an agent or employee whose training is limited to one week and seventy hours of work per annum? Yet this is what Congress is doing at this very moment.* Washington summed up the whole question in a nutshell when he declared that:

"Regular troops alone are equal to the exigencies of modern war, as well for defence as offence, and whenever a substitute is attempted it must prove illusory and ruinous. No Militia will ever acquire the habits necessary to resist a regular force. . . . The firmness requisite for the real business of fighting is only to be attained by a constant course of discipline and service. I have never yet been witness to a single instance that can justify a different opinion, and *it is most earnestly to be wished that the liberties of America may no longer be trusted, in any material degree, to so precarious a dependence."*

If war were to break out at the present time, the only troops upon which the United States could place any real dependence against the trained regulars of foreign nations would be the Regular Army—100,000 men.

Unlimited as our military resources unquestionably are, Congress has thus far failed utterly to foster and develop them, so that they may actually be a source of weakness by inviting attack. By contrast with our military resources, although undeveloped, our actual military strength is the feeblest of all the great Powers, as the following schedule will show:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Country.	Population.[1]	Budget (in dollars).	Total war strength of army.	Peace strength of regular establishment.	Number of men in peace establishment to each 1,000 of population.	Relative size of peace establishments per 1,000 inhabitants, the U. S. army being taken as a unit.
Austria-Hungary.	45,405,267	61,285,577	2,580,000	326,498	7.19	8.5
France.....	38,961,495	131,110,673	4,350,000	580,420	12.58	14.9
Germany.....	56,367,178	153,917,694	5,240,000	582,498	10.33	12.3
Great Britain[2]...	41,826,457	157,517,524	884,095	217,000[3]	5.18	6.1
Japan[4].....	46,732,841	18,561,133	632,007[5]	167,629[6]	3.58	4.2
Russia[7].....	106,264,136	185,790,417	5,258,000	1,110,000	10.44	12.4
United States[8]...	76,303,387	77,655,162[9]	100,000[10]	64,336	0.84	1.0

It must be borne in mind that we have never yet been pitted against the land forces of any first-class military Power. If the United States were to fight any of these nations at the present time how much success could its 100,000 dependable troops hope for against their trained regulars? How long could our army cope with the 800,000 veterans Japan was known to have had in Manchuria? and history has recorded events far more improbable than that we may ultimately have to fight her in the Philippines. At present we are at peace with all the world, and it is sincerely to be hoped that we shall continue our amicable relations for a long time to come; but, from the standpoint of true statesmanship, there is much sound advice in Machiavelli's maxim, "Treat your friends as if they will some day become your enemies, and your enemies as if they will some day become your friends." It is well-known to the military authorities of every nation that Japan could put her entire army in the Philippines within a month, the steaming-time from Nagasaki to Manila being about five days. How much chance would our forces have against her 800,000 veterans? Even if we possessed—which we do not—a large enough merchant marine to furnish the requisite number of transports to carry our entire Regular Army at once to the Philippines, our troops would be overwhelmed by mere numbers, our Volunteers certainly could not be got ready to sail within that time, and our Militia is prohibited by the Constitu-

[1] Census of 1900, except in the case of Japan, whose population was taken in 1903. Most of the statistics in this table are taken from the Statesman's Year Book for 1905.—[2] England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland.—[3] Exclusive of the Indian Army, and 10,000 required for the Somaliland Expedition.—[4] The principal Islands.—[5] Last Official Statement, Dec. 31st, 1900. The actual war strength of the Japanese Army is between 900,000 and 1,000,000.—[6] Last Official Statement.—[7] Russia in Europe.—[8] Exclusive of Alaska and the Colonies.—[9] Report of the Secretary of War for the year 1905, p. 62.—[10] Exclusive of Volunteers and Militia.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion from being used as such outside of the United States. The German military authorities claim that they can embark an army corps in three days, and, allowing sixteen days for crossing the Atlantic, could land more than 200,000 trained regulars within the territorial limits of the United States in five weeks; while it is also well known that, if we should ever be unfortunate enough to come to blows with England, she could put fully 150,000 trained troops on our northern boundary in thirty days. It is left to the reader to draw his own conclusions as to the ability of the United States to fight these forces with its present army and its untrained Volunteers and Militia.

An army is in reality nothing more than a national police; and, unless it is strong enough to maintain order at home and to prevent encroachment and insult from abroad, endless evils and shame must be suffered by the entire people. A strong army protects a nation against such calamities, and may therefore be likened to a strong insurance company conducted by the Government. According to the last statement prepared by the Bureau of Statistics, the "true valuation of real and personal property" in the United States amounted, in 1900, to no less than $94,300,000,000. The maintenance of the Regular Army of 64,336 officers and men in 1905 cost $77,655,162.80, so that this charge, considered from the standpoint of insurance alone, is only 0.83 mills on the dollar or 83-1000 of one per cent. on the valuation of property. An army three times the size of our present army would, it is estimated, cost less than twice the above rate, or about $1.66 *per annum* on every $1,000 of property. The minimum rate of insurance upon dwelling-houses in cities is about $1.50, and on offices seldom less than $3 a year on each $1,000 of property insured. If the reader is a business man, let him compare the rates which he pays the insurance companies with those charged by the United States Government, and ask himself whether he considers $1.66 an exorbitant yearly rate for the security which would be afforded to the nation by an army of 193,000 trained regulars.

Furthermore, there is an ethical as well as a business reason why the United States ought to possess more and better trained soldiers—Regular, Militia and Volunteer—than it now has. In law, contributory negligence which culminates in injury to life or property is always punished, yet our legislators have gone on,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from 1776 down to the present day, apparently blind to the obligation that, as Adams declared, adequate "national defence is one of the cardinal duties of statesmen," and it is indeed a most lamentable fact that *never once have our soldiers gone into a war for which Congress has made the necessary preparations beforehand.* Although one is fully ready to grant that awful blunders have often been made by the Army itself, yet, on the other hand, one cannot refrain from asking whether any set of men in whose hands reposes the power to mould the military organization and to provide all military supplies has the right—moral or otherwise—to send the flower of a country's manhood to be sacrificed on the altar of national honor? At the very best, "war is hell"; and, when our soldiers are forced to die by thousands from wounds, fever, starvation, and lack of medicines and attention, who will attempt to hold blameless the legislators who have neglected their duty? When a man dies through the neglect of another man who might have prevented his death, does not the law call this neglect by a very dire name and punish it accordingly? Is the War Department accountable because, when 200,000 trained soldiers are needed at the outbreak of war, only half that number are forthcoming? Is the War Department responsible, when vast quantities of supplies and medical stores are needed, that only a fraction is provided? Is the War Department to be blamed, when experienced officers are required to lead troops and to administer the branches of the Staff, and experienced surgeons to care for the sick and wounded, because ignorance and parsimony at the Capitol refuse to authorize their employment or to provide them with the proper education? Are Secretaries of War to be held at fault because they have inherited vicious systems and defective organizations which are utterly inadequate to the stress of war, when they were not responsible for the creation of them and when the genius of a Napoleon in their place would be powerless to make the proper changes? Have not the military blunders of our legislators cost appallingly enough already? How much longer are Americans to be taxed for the military education of our legislators who will *not* learn?

Most of us have thought heretofore that the United States had ample military protection, but we have been wofully deceived. If that wonderful fighting-machine known as the "Army

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Austerlitz," of which Napoleon was so proud, abounded in defects which were clearly perceptible upon close examination, with how much more force could that criticism be applied to our Militia and Volunteers in their present condition? Only part of our Militia is organized, and even the organized portion is to-day so very deficient in training as to be practically useless against the regulars of other nations. On paper they may appear formidable enough, but in reality they are very similar to the feet of clay of the imposing figure in Nebuchadnezzar's dream. To be sure, our Regular Army may be likened to the iron legs; but, on the other hand, we must realize that, even if it were mobilized and recruited to the full war strength of 100,000 allowed by Congress, this process would require a minimum of sixty days under the most favorable circumstances. Furthermore, in the event of war we should undoubtedly have to keep 20,000 of the old troops in the Philippines and possibly have to send more of them to these islands. The remaining 40,476 enlisted men would have to be increased to 80,000, the result of which would be that *the Army within the United States would therefore contain only a fraction less than fifty per cent. of recruits,* thus greatly diminishing its actual fighting efficiency at the outset of war. In plain English, these are the numbers and this is the quality of the forces upon which, thanks to Congress, Americans would have to depend for their protection if war were declared to-morrow.

One hundred and twenty-five years ago Washington declared that we "ought to have a good army rather than a large one," and this statement is equally true at the present day. We do not require an immense standing army such as is maintained by each of the leading European nations, but we ought, assuredly, to have an army which should number in time of peace fully one soldier to each 1,000 of population, and in time of war at least 250,000. Since the exigencies of the professions and of business will undoubtedly prevent its ever being possible to give the Militia the training which would enable it to cope with foreign regulars, this organization must be relegated to the third line of defence, and nothing more should be expected of it. The creation of a First Reserve similar to that which exists in every European army is therefore imperative, and this Reserve ought to consist at least of 100,000 men who have had some previous experi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence in the Regular Army or in the United States Volunteers during actual war. If Congress will only provide some such organization *in sufficient time to be in thorough working order before our next war,* and, in its formation, will carefully remember the cardinal rule enunciated by Calhoun eighty-five years ago, *viz.: "that at the commencement of hostilities there should be nothing either to new model or create,"*[1] some profit will then at last have been derived from the costly lessons of the past, and the United States may finally be assured of adequate protection.

No nation in the entire history of the world has yet neglected its military strength without ultimately paying the penalty. France was the foremost military power from 1800 to 1812,

[1] The Act of March 2nd, 1821, was the outcome of a resolution of the House of Representatives on May 11th, 1820, directing the Secretary of War to report at the next session "a plan for the reduction of the Army to 6,000 non-commissioned officers and privates. . . ."

The plan presented by Mr. Calhoun is worthy of the most careful study even at the present time; it is a most remarkable document, inasmuch as he traced the general scheme for an expansive organization such as every army in Europe has now found it necessary to adopt. In his report to Congress, made in December, 1820, Mr Calhoun wrote:

"*If our liberty should ever be endangered by the military power gaining the ascendency, it will be from the necessity of making those mighty and irregular efforts to retrieve our affairs after a series of disasters, caused by the want of adequate military knowledge,* just as in our physical system a state of the most dangerous excitement and paroxysm follows that of the greatest debility and prostration. *To avoid these dangerous consequences, and to prepare the country to meet a state of war, particularly at its commencement, with honor and safety, much must depend on the organization of our military peace establishment,* and I have accordingly, in a plan about to be proposed for the reduction of the Army, directed my attention mainly to that point, believing it to be of the greatest importance.

"*To give such an organization, the leading principles in its formation ought to be that, at the commencement of hostilities, there should be nothing either to new model or to create. The only difference, consequently, between the peace and the war formation of the Army, ought to be in the increased magnitude of the latter, and the only change in passing from the former to the latter should consist in giving to it the augmentation which will then be necessary.*

"*It is thus, and thus only, the dangerous transition from peace to war may be made without confusion or disorder, and the weakness and danger which otherwise would be inevitable be avoided. Two consequences result from this principle: First, the organization of the staff in a peace establishment ought to be such that every branch of it should be completely formed, with such extension as the number of troops and posts occupied may render necessary; and, secondly, that the organization of the line ought, as far as practicable, to be such that, in passing from the peace to the war formation, the force may be sufficiently augmented without adding new regiments or battalions, thus raising the war on the basis of the peace establishment, instead of creating a new army to be added to the old,* as at the commencement of the late war." —American State Papers, II, p. 189. The italics are ours.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and again in 1860, and Russia was presumed to be invincible less than three years ago. Yet we all know what terrible humiliation France underwent in 1870-1871 and what defeats Russia has just suffered. Do we fondly imagine that we are going to escape the consequences, when, in actual fact, we are not one whit better prepared for war than they were? We have gone on entirely too long laboring under a grave delusion, and giving a new version to the old proverb so as to make it read, "The Lord takes care of babes, fools and the United States!" We have become a "World-Power," with duties and responsibilities which we never have had before. We have rich possessions upon which other nations naturally look with covetous eyes; we have a great country whose prosperity is unexampled. Unless we are strong enough to hold the one and to protect the other, our day of reckoning is sure to come.

When will our American people awake to the facts, and when will our legislators heed the handwriting on the wall?

FREDERIC LOUIS HUIDEKOPER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SCIENTIFIC AGRICULTURE.

BY FRANCES EVELYN, COUNTESS OF WARWICK.

It has been cynically set down as characteristic of the average Englishman that he does the best possible things in the worst possible way. Given a perfect site, like Trafalgar Square, the inappreciative Londoner fills it with Landseer lions, squirting fountains, and a Nelson Column, and he crowns the whole with a pepper-box perched on the National Gallery; while the resourceful Parisian, with far inferior advantages, makes the Place de la Concorde a thing of beauty and a joy forever. Perhaps this is true, and possibly from the foot you may judge Hercules.

In like manner, and as another illustration of the same phase of character, the English farmer, with a soil above reproach, and a climate—whatever may be said against it—free from the vicious extremes of drought and deluge, has not made as much as he might have made out of his broad acres; and the Englishman even now dreads defects in his navy, not from any abstract fear of invasion, but from the exceedingly concrete alarm lest some foreign foe may intercept those merchant ships by means of which he is fed at the hand of other nations, as literally as though John Bull were a great grown-up child.

He is going to change all this—is, indeed, in process of doing so; but, like all his changes, this altered *modus operandi* in agriculture comes about very slowly, and is made only after its advocates have been for a long while denounced as faddists. When it is adopted by and by, it will be rushed and carried to any extent, just as, after scraping chin and cheek for ages, John Bull woke up one morning and found himself bearded like the pard.

Perhaps, however, in the special department of agriculture this neglect of opportunities, and failure to keep pace with the times, is less a national peculiarity than one ingrained in the subject.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even the sometimes boastful Frenchman owns the impeachment of neglect in this special pursuit, as a distinguished French Professor acknowledged. Said M. Berthelot, addressing the Agricultural Society of France:

"The good old times of ignorance raised to a principle have passed away. Science cannot be reserved for a narrow oligarchy. It is important that all the citizens of a free country shall share in the highest ideal. No ideal is superior to that of agriculture. Country life is the normal type of human life. In it only can manhood be developed in its plenitude. Country life favors at once material health of body and moral soundness of mind. The robust, industrious and intelligent countryman has always constituted the strength of nations."

But the ideal rustic seems to have contented himself, all the world over, with resting on that fact. He appears to have taken it for granted—this happy, healthy rustic—that what did for his forefathers will do for him. Other departments of life have their developments and go with the times, but who ever dreamed of calling agriculture a science, or pursuing it by scientific methods?

Well, the schoolmaster—often identified with the faddist—is abroad, and has found a good deal of late years, to teach his somewhat rebellious pupils.

First and foremost, here in England, he is pointing out, and we "cannot choose but hear," that the land has been allowed to go out of cultivation, until we have become to a very dangerous extent dependent on foreign nations for our foodstuffs, and if by chance, in these days of quick changes, we should find ourselves "isolated," as the contumacious clergy are by their bishops, we should be at a loss to get the wherewithal for a square meal. This is the point that is being constantly mentioned, though with bated breath, in England; and the possibility of such a danger results from the twofold cause that the land has been allowed to go uncultivated, and that we have neglected to keep pace with the times in treating what is under culture. Possibly the two causes resolve themselves into one. People do not neglect a remunerative occupation; and, if intelligence had been brought to bear on agriculture, it would have paid so well that there would have been no temptation to relinquish it in favor of other pursuits. The rural exodus would not have occurred, and overcrowding in city populations would have been avoided.

Our contention is that the soil of England is sufficient to feed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the population: that there are more than adequate supplies of labor available (we have our own special "fad" on that subject, of course), and that the missing link is the non-application to this particular science of the method which we apply to all other sciences. In one word, we degrade agriculture from its position as a science. We fail to realize that it is a science.

Why? Doubtless, in the first instance, on account of its immemorial antiquity. It dates from the beginning of things. The earliest occupation of aboriginal man—*and* woman, I personally may be allowed to remark—was to dress the garden and to till the ground. I must ask to be allowed the luxury of an occasional first person singular pronoun; and I would say that I include under the one science, for the purpose of this thesis, the twin occupations of agriculture and horticulture, just as I myself make no distinction between the male and female laborer on the soil. These are the initial sciences. With regard to any new upstart of a science, like geology, biology, or even phrenology, which are, by comparison, things of yesterday, no difficulty whatever is felt in giving them due rank and precedence; but, because agriculture dates back to hoar antiquity and has its archives in Egypt, Mesopotamia and China, we reverse our ordinary reverence for age, and seem to think that any rule-of-thumb work is good enough for the tiller of the ground.

Of course, it is easy to torture this attitude of neglect into its exact opposite, and to say, as if enunciating some fine old crusted Conservative maxim, that, by taking agriculture out of the category of ordinary sciences, we are exempting it from the fluctuations to which more recent sciences are liable. The plough, we submit, is now virtually the same implement as Hesiod describes in his "Works and Days," or Virgil in his poem on Husbandry. That is all very true, but quite inconclusive. Agriculture has not stood still; and if the agriculturist thinks fit to assume an attitude of stagnation, he will simply be left behind in the race of progress.

Now, it is something to have got this fact enunciated by a real live professor at one of our ancient English Universities, which are often certainly identified with a dead and buried past. "A hundred years ago," said the Sibthorpian Professor of Rural Economy at Oxford, by way of claiming for Agricultural Science a place in a University Education, "Agricultural Science was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

almost exclusively associated with botany. The term Agricultural Chemistry, now so familiar, comes first into prominence as the title of Sir Humphry Davy's lectures before the Board of Agriculture, published in 1813." Biology, too, has its sphere in the various problems connected with the soil. "Our knowledge of the life and work of the minute living organisms dwelling in the soil," says the same Professor, "is as yet only commencing; but the facts already learned respecting the functions discharged by several species of them are so remarkable that they will rank among the chief discoveries of the century." It is well pointed out that, a hundred years ago, agriculture was only an art having few points of contact with natural science. But the term Agricultural Science is no longer a misnomer. To speak of geology as a natural science, and to deny the same rank to the modern science of agriculture, is utterly illogical. Outside pure mathematics, all our sciences are more or less mixed. They are groups of facts related to each other, but with special reference to some definite subject. Such is the case with chemistry, physics, botany, physiology, and such, too, is the case with agriculture. It is as much a department of science as geology or medicine. As practised by the average farmer, it is an art. As taught by the professor, it may be pure science; but the ideal scientific agriculture is that combination of profession with practice which constitutes a mixed science, and more than justifies the expression "Scientific Agriculture."

In 1893, the Royal Agricultural Society passed a resolution to the following effect: That, in the opinion of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, it is desirable that provision be made in all Universities for the granting of a degree in Science for students of agriculture. The importance of the subject has, for more than a century, been recognized in the Scotch Universities; and, in the University of Durham, agriculture has since 1890 been among the subjects qualifying for a degree in Science. More recent still is the work done by the University Extension College at Reading, where the curriculum is in itself a justification of the scientific status occupied by agriculture. The subjects are: (1) Agriculture proper; (2) Chemistry; (3) Biology; (4) Mathematics; (5) Geology; (6) Engineering; (7) Physiology and Hygiene, etc.

It is satisfactory to reflect that this identification of agri-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

culture with such a galaxy of recognized sciences has not been reached *per saltum,* by a hop, skip and a jump, but in the due and orderly course of evolution. To be, for one moment, chronological, we may look back so far as the period of the wars that grew out of the French Revolution. At this epoch, say from 1795 to 1814, the price of provisions gave a great stimulus to agriculture in England. The Royal Agricultural Society, however, was not founded until 1838. Its objects were avowedly to encourage improvements in agriculture, such, for instance, as the application of chemistry thereto, the study of mechanics and engineering for the construction of agricultural implements, of botany for variations in grain, and forestry for the development of different growths.

Prominent among the provisions of the century stand the processes of deep ploughing and thorough draining; the construction of the steam-plough, of reaping and threshing machines; the chemical combination of artificial manures, and the use of ensilage. Surveying these advances along different lines of science, some optimists have not hesitated to say that the agriculture of Great Britain has more than kept pace with that of other countries. And it is really refreshing to be able to entertain such an estimate, just at a time when alarmists are crying out that our trade has emigrated to Germany, and our military prestige vanished into thin air. What if, after all, a revived and scientific agriculture should be destined to form for England the Great Compensation!

Orderly though the development of our science has been, then, from 1815 to the present the advance has been by leaps and bounds, especially in the departments of machinery, chemistry, and that organic faction of the latter science which trenches on physiology. It is well to regard the circles of expansion in that order, taking machinery as the earliest or most rudimentary. This, when we come to think of it, represents nothing beyond the manipulation of material. It creates nothing; but merely aids and increases the productive force of nature. Chemistry is the great agent, especially in the way of artificial fertilizers; and the part of physiology is one that suggests endless possibilities, as, for instance, in the prolongation of human life, and the protection of lower animal life against epidemics. The science of selection has yet its work to make in the department of agriculture; but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the possibilities are boundless and full of encouragement, based as they are on the study of living nature.

One word more—one additional Professor to complete my trio—a final subsidence into the first person singular, and I have done.

It is, of course, on such a subject as this, distinctly advantageous to get the testimony of *savants,* and especially so when they are not, as was the case with M. Berthelot and with the Sibthorpian Professor, enlightening their audiences on this special subject, but just throwing a side-light which is all the more valuable because unstudied.

Professor Francis William Newman, brother of the Cardinal and formerly occupant of the Latin Chair in London University, wrote on the subject of Diet, with the special object of glorifying Vegetarianism. With that, or any other of his "isms" (which were many), we are not concerned. Taking the two aboriginal pursuits of pasturage and tillage, however, the "Emeritus" Professor, as he delighted to call himself, brought the full force of his heavy statistics to bear on this project of Scientific Agriculture. He takes the advance from hunting, *via* pasturage, to tillage as marking distinct grades in the development of civilization, the transition from pasture to agriculture being even more marked than the substitution of tame cattle for quarry; and, with special reference to agriculture in England, Professor Newman finds special importance in the fact that, on an island limited in size like Great Britain, "to produce as much human food as *one* acre of cultivated land will yield, *three* or even *four* acres of grazing-land are needed."

Putting professors out of the question, however, and treating the subject as one of ordinary experience, with which any person of average intelligence is qualified to deal, it is obvious that agriculture must, like everything else, keep pace with the times. There are, at all events in nature, no exceptions. All goes by rule, and all must conform to the law of progress. It would be no advantage to agriculture to perch it on a pedestal and insist on keeping it just as it was in the days of our grandsires. On the contrary we must bring it down to the level of ordinary life, and give it every advantage we can from progressive discoveries. Then, and then only, can we with any confidence say of a science as to which the aspiration is peculiarly appropriate—"*Floreat!*"

F. E. Warwick.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON THE PUBLISHING OF PLAYS.

BY BRANDER MATTHEWS, PROFESSOR OF DRAMATIC LITERATURE IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

It is recorded in Mr. Morley's biography that, in a debate of the Essay Club, which Gladstone founded when he was an undergraduate at Oxford, it was finally decided that "the influence of the modern drama, though trifling in degree" was "in quality pernicious." The biographer does not inform us whether this verdict covered the modern drama in other languages than English; but it was rendered in 1830, just as Victor Hugo was bringing out "Hernani," the earliest of the Romanticist plays which were to prepare the path for the later Realistic pieces of Augier and Dumas *fils*. Probably the conservative young aristocrats of Oxford would have arrived at the same decision if they had known Hugo's lyrical melodramas, and if they had foreseen the comedies of Augier and of Dumas. The conclusion to which they came, nearly fourscore years ago, is one which could scarcely be disputed by a student of the English dramatic literature of the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century.

But, in the final quarter of that century, there began to be signs of a returning vitality in the drama of our own tongue, and its influence began to be neither trifling nor pernicious. Probably the stimulus of this revival may be due in a measure to Ibsen, whose social dramas, acted and read and discussed, proved that it was again possible to deal in the theatre, seriously and even austerely, with themes of compelling importance. Both in Great Britain and in the United States men of letters were aroused to take a more intelligent interest in the stage. Especially significant of this new birth is the fact that the acted drama is again printed and published, to be read and to assert its ancient right to a place on the shelves of the library, as well as on the boards of the theatre. Not only are the dramatic works of foreign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

writers, Rostand and Sudermann, d'Annunzio and Echegaray, translated for the reader, but the practical playwrights of our own language, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Pinero, Mr. Thomas and Mr. Fitch, have been encouraged to publish their plays.

These working dramatists thus revealed their willingness to be judged by the double test, that of the stage, first of all, of course, and that of the study afterward, recognizing the position of the library as the tribunal of last resort, even though the theatre must ever be the court of first instance. It is true that certain other dramatists, Mr. Bronson Howard, Mr. Gillette and Mr. Barrie, who have succeeded in interesting thousands of spectators, have not yet been moved to publish their plays for the pleasure of hundreds of readers; but there is no reason to suppose that they will not sooner or later follow the example of their fellow craftsmen. It is to be hoped that the habit of play-reading may become as well established among the English-speaking peoples as it has been always among the French, in whose language the drama has never been allowed to divorce itself from literature.

Of course, there is no need that all the plays that please us on the stage should be published in the vain belief that they will delight us also in the study. In every period when the drama has flourished most luxuriantly, a majority of the pieces performed with profit are devoid of those indefinable qualities which warrant us in classing them as literature. There is no need that they should have these qualities; and their triumph in the theatre is due to their possession of purely theatric merits. As Voltaire once asserted, we all know "that, in the playhouse, it does not take much to make that successful which we despise in the reading." It cannot be said too often or too emphatically that the drama, even if it sometimes attains to the loftiest heights of poetry, is always a department of the show business. This double aspect of the drama is admirably set forth in the prologue of "Faust"; and Goethe would not deny that only now and again does the drama rise into literature. Only now and again, even in the richest epochs of dramatic poetry, do we find a succession of masterpieces, solidly framed in accordance with the demands of the actual theatre of its own time, and informed also with the veracity and the humanity which we expect in real literature.

That the majority of the plays presented in the theatres of London under Elizabeth and James were pretty poor stuff must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be confessed frankly by every student of that glorious epoch. That the majority of the plays performed in the Athenian theatre were also pretty poor stuff will be admitted as highly probable by every scholar who seizes the significance of the fact that there were hundreds of these lyrical dramas, and that only a scant two-score of the accepted masterpieces of the three acknowledged chiefs have been preserved for our profit. Indisputably, we should have a higher opinion of the Elizabethan drama if there were extant only half a hundred of its very best specimens. It is unfair to suppose that Greek tragedy, as a whole, attained to the exalted level of Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides; and we can easily convince ourselves that the loss would be small if we had been forever deprived of the many plays brought out abundantly by the forgotten contemporaries of Corneille, Molière and Racine.

The more conscientiously we study the history of the drama, the more certainly we come to the conclusion that there has never been a time when most of the plays actually presented on the stage would not justify the contempt expressed by Dr. Johnson, who had himself failed as a dramatist. "The theatre," he said, "is peopled by such characters as were never seen, conversing in a language which was never heard, upon topicks which will never arise in the commerce of mankind." Yet these pieces, which the burly dogmatist despised, and which would to-day seem to us empty and absurd, if we could see them acted, may have provided the specific pleasure of the theatre for those who first saw them performed. There is no reason why these pieces should ever be published; they belong to the theatre, and to the theatre only, and in the theatre they should be left. They have no claim for promotion to the library. Who wants to read the text of "The Black Crook"? Who wants to read the words of "The Two Orphans"?—even though the latter is really a masterpiece of play-making mechanism, of sheer dramaturgic craftsmanship.

It was on the occasion of the centenary of the birth of Scribe,—that master craftsman who was in no sense a man of letters, but who was in every sense a man of the theatre, influencing the development of the drama in almost every direction,—it was on this appropriate occasion that a French student of the stage set forth clearly the fact, so often overlooked by purely literary critics, that there are plays, not a few and not unimportant, "which address themselves far more to the eye and to the ear

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than to the mind, and which therefore need care little about literary form." Among the non-literary elements of a play is the plot, that is, "the combination of events, and often also these events themselves." There is a part of any tragic or comic action, consisting solely in spectacle, in things seen or heard, "deeds or gestures, tears or laughter, which is untranslatable by the written word, and which even if it contributes to literature at times, and serves now and then as a support of literature, is not integrally related to it." Often theatric art consists solely in this adroit combination of events; and "there have been, and there always will be, pieces which, even if they happen to be carefully written, owe all their effect to this alone." But sometimes an interpreting imagination and a beauty of form are added to this ingenuity of combination, "are superimposed on this essential element of theatric art—then, and then only, can the drama claim to be a department of literature."

In other words, theatric art may be sufficient unto itself without the aid of literature. Invention and construction, the appeal to the eye and to the ear, the ingenious utilization of contrast, climax and suspense;—these qualities are essential in the theatre, and in the theatre they may suffice for our pleasure with little or no aid from literature. Without these qualities the drama is a thing of naught; and, therefore, the so-called "drama for the closet" is a contradiction in terms, an arrant absurdity, having as little relation to the true drama as the architectural fantasies of Piranesi have to the art of building. But when a play has only these essential qualities, it is for the theatre alone; it is not for the library. It is actable, even if it is unreadable, just as the dramatic poems of Shelley and of Swinburne are unactable, even if they are readable. Only when a play possesses also certain added merits, not easily specified, does it rise into literature, and take its proper position in the study as well as on the stage.

"Dramatic works," so Fontenelle declared two centuries ago, "have two tribunals to satisfy, both equally dangerous, one because it is too tumultuous, the other because it is too quiet; and a work is fully assured of glory only when the quiet tribunal has confirmed the decision of the tumultuous tribunal." And the younger Dumas said the same thing, even more sharply, when he asserted that "the spectator can give only success, it is the reader who confers renown."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As the qualities essential in the theatre are the same, whether the play has indisputable literary merit or is almost devoid of this, it is often difficult to declare whether a play is or is not really possessed of literary merit. A play having the essential theatric qualification may have more or less literary merit; and there is no little difficulty in drawing a line of demarcation. Of all Shakespere's predecessors, for instance, Kyd is the most accomplished playwright, and his "Spanish Tragedy" had an immediate success and a prolonged vogue. But is it a piece of literature, or is it only a turgid melodrama? Of all the popular dramatic authors in England in the midyears of the nineteenth century, Lytton was the most popular, and every young actress wanted to display herself in "The Lady of Lyons." But is that a piece of literature, or is it only a clever example of tawdry theatricalism? What about the "Louis XI" which Irving made so startlingly effective? What about "The Fool's Revenge" which Booth sustained by the might of his histrionic art? The French originals of these plays were written, one by Casimir Delavigne and the other by Victor Hugo; but is either play really literature in the loftier meaning of the word? Does it reward the reader, as it rewarded the spectator? And how about "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray" of Mr. Pinero, and the "Liars" of Mr. Jones, the "Alabama" of Mr. Thomas and the "Climbers" of Mr. Fitch? Are their merits merely theatric, or have they also enough of the indefinable quality which is needful to make us accept them also as literature? Take the comic operas of Mr. Gilbert, "Patience" and "Pinafore"; do they deserve consideration as literature, the same consideration as we are ready to give to Sheridan's "Duenna" and to Gay's "Beggar's Opera"?

Such are the questions we can now answer for ourselves, since these contemporary playwrights, having won favorable verdict from the tumultuous tribunal of the theatre, are now publishing their plays to ask the judgment also of the quiet tribunal of the library. This is a return to the former practice of the playmakers of our language, a practice which endured as late as the beginning of the nineteenth century. A publisher offered Sheridan two thousand pounds for the right to print "Pizarro"; and one at least of the books which Miss Lydia Languish hastened to hide when Sir Anthony Absolute was announced was a play. In Richardson's "Sir Charles Grandison," Miss Byron,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

writing to Miss Selby, said, "I know, my dear, you love to read plays," and thereupon the fair correspondent promptly threw her narrative into dialogue, as though it was a scene from a drama. In one of Hazlitt's essays, he declared that "to read a good comedy is to keep the best company in the world, where the best things are said, and the most amusing happen."

If it was profitable to publish English plays in the eighteenth century, and if the young ladies of that remote era liked to read plays, this was partly because the drama had not yet been thrust into the background by the swelling vogue of the novel,—a vogue which followed swiftly on the sweeping success of Scott's romances, and which now shows little sign of abating even after fourscore years. When Richardson wrote "Sir Charles Grandison," the novel had not yet established itself as a formidable rival of the play; and readers who enjoyed story-telling were then accustomed to gratify their liking for adventure by the perusal of play-books rather than of prose romances, then fewer in quantity and inferior in quality. Within the century after Richardson, the conditions were totally changed, and the novel became not only more abundant than the play, but also far superior to it. In prose fiction Scott had been followed by Dickens and by Thackeray, whereas in the drama there was nobody to sustain the unequal comparison but Bulwer or Boucicault. It is not to be wondered at that the habit of reading plays died out.

Now, in this first decade of the twentieth century, after the divorce of the drama and literature has lasted some threescore years and ten, the span of a man's life, there seems to be a likelihood of a reconciliation. No sign will be more hopeful for the future of our dramatic literature than a revival of the habit of reading plays. Even for the readers themselves, there will be many advantages in acquiring this habit, since the drama is in itself a nobler form than the novel, and since the perusal of the contemporary playwrights may tempt a chosen few to the pleasure they can find in the dramatic poets of the past. For some readers there may be other advantages; and the womanly author of the clever "Counsels of a Worldly Godmother" has recently insisted on the benefit to be derived from reading and reading and rereading and again reading the best dramatists, in order to learn from them the secret of dialogue: "That is the best school for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conversation, and it is one which every girl who would make the most of herself should be trained in."

There is no reason to suppose that the published play is likely to succeed in substituting itself for the novel in the hands of the average reader; the position of prose fiction is not really in danger. But there is no reason why the average reader of to-day should not now find the same pleasure in the perusal of a play that was felt by the average reader of Sheridan's time or of Richardson's. The chief obstacle to his reacquiring the habit of reading plays is one which the playwrights have it in their power to remove at once. He is now accustomed to the flowing narrative of the novel, and he does not find it easy to understand the summary indications of places and of action which are all that most playwrights are willing to provide him with. The dramatists must accept the situation; and, if they wish a play to be read, they must present it in print so that it is easy to read. They must clothe the play with certain of the graces of the prose fiction to which the average reader is now accustomed, and which he has learned to expect. They must amplify their descriptions of character and of action, as aids to his sluggish imagination enervated by a too exclusive devotion to the novel. In other words, they must translate what they have written in the shorthand of the theatre into the fuller and customary language of the library.

Of necessity, the practical playwrights think in terms of the actual theatre of their own time. This is what Sophocles did, and Shakespere, and Molière. To-day they conceive the story as taking place on the stage itself, with a succession of painted sets as its backgrounds. Their intentions as to these painted sets and as to the movements of the characters therein, they express in what may be called the sign language of the stage, a speech scientifically precise and entirely satisfactory to the playwrights themselves, to the stage-manager, to the actors, and to all those who live, move and have their being in the theatre. To the average reader, however, this sign language is not only incomprehensible, it is also irritating and repellent; he does not know what to make of it; and he is as unwilling to take the trouble to fathom its mysteries as he is to acquire the art of understanding the signals of the Morse code ticked off by the telegraph-sounder.

Here, for example, is the baldly brief manner in which the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scene at the opening of the second act of the "Esmeralda" of Mrs. Burnett and Mr. Gillette is described in the stage edition of that interesting play:

"*Scene.—Studio. Easel up R C—small table for paint above to R of it. Table down L bowl on it. Table down R. Window C. D R 3—D L 3—Cupboard R 2. Fireplace R 2.*

"*Discovered.—Nora and Kate in pretty, quaint costumes. Nora up C at easel; Kate left at table. Kate decorating large punch-bowl. Nora painting panel.*"

And here again is the way in which Boucicault indicated summarily, and for the stage-manager only, the thrilling escape of Shaun in his most effective Irish play "Arrah-na-Pogue," a drama which had a little of the glamour of Celtic romance:

"*Wall descends. Shaun climbs up as wall descends, and by the ledge reaches 2nd flat of wall. Climbs up as it descends, and upon the set platform of room, when the Soldier (coming on and going off R.) has his back turned to him. Shaun goes up to the cannon, climbs on it and out of gap. Soldier comes on, looks off front, down the wall, while Shaun climbs through gap. Soldier exits, R. Shaun is seen back of 4th groove, flat, climbing along wall to exit, R. All is worked down. Gas up.*"

Now, it is simply absurd to suppose that the average reader, accustomed to the ampler description of the modern novel, will take any interest in these shorthand indications. If the playwright wants to have his play read by the general public, he must translate it out of the special dialect of the stage folk into the speech of the people. Just as the full score of an orchestral work is transposed for the simpler piano, so the prompt copy of a piece needs to be expanded when the play is published in the hope of pleasing the reader as it has already pleased the spectators. A rumor is current that one of the most adroit and artistic of American playwrights was indignant that a firm of publishers had summarily declined to print one of his most effective plays. But his indignation was wholly without warrant if he had presented to the publishers the manuscript of his piece in the shape in which he would present it to the managers. This American playwright is wont to take infinite pains with the presentation of his pieces before the spectators in the theatre; and he ought to have foreseen the necessity of taking some trouble also to prepare his play for the different needs of the reader in the library.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So much of the purely theatric effect will be lost in the transference of the drama from the stage to the study, that the least the dramatist can do is to put forth every effort to preserve as much as may be possible, and to make it easy for the willing reader to reconstruct for himself the actual performance.

This is what has been done very carefully by some modern dramatists who have devised their plays for the actual theatre, first and foremost, but who have also taken into account the necessities of the mere reader. Here, for example, is the opening description of Ibsen's "Little Eyolf," in which we are supplied at once with all that is needful for us to visualize, first, the place where the story begins to unfold itself, and, second, the appearance of the two important characters who begin the play:

"*A pretty and richly decorated garden-room, full of furniture, flowers and plants. At the back, open glass doors, leading out to a veranda. An extensive view over the fjord. In the distance, wooded hillsides. A door in each of the side walls, the one on the right a folding-door, placed far back. In front on the right, a sofa, with cushions and rugs. Beside the sofa, a small table and chairs. In front, to the left, a larger table with arm-chairs around it. On the table stands an open hand-bag. It is an early summer morning, with warm sunshine.*

"*Mrs. Rita Allmers stands beside the table, facing towards the left, engaged in unpacking the bag. She is a handsome, rather tall, well-developed blonde, about thirty years of age, dressed in a light-colored morning-gown.*

"*Shortly after, Miss Asta Allmers enters by the door on the right, wearing a light-brown summer dress, with hat, jacket and parasol. Under her arm she carries a rather large locked portfolio. She is slim, of middle height, with dark hair, and deep, earnest eyes. Twenty-five years old.*"

Even more elaborate are the indications of scenery and of stage business which Mr. Bernard Shaw has employed to make his plays easy reading. These descriptions are never telegraphic in their brevity; they are ample and rich in characteristic detail. They are always as readable as the dialogue itself; and they are often quite as amusing. Here, for instance, is a portion only of the several elaborate paragraphs by means of which Mr. Shaw, at the very beginning of his play, introduces to us two of the characters who are to take part in "The Devil's Disciple":

"*At the most wretched hour between a black night and a wintry morning in the year 1777, Mrs. Dudgeon, of New Hampshire, is sitting*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up in the kitchen and general dwelling-room of her farm-house on the outskirts of the town of Websterbridge. She is not a prepossessing woman. No woman looks her best after sitting up all night; and Mrs. Dudgeon's face, even at its best, is grimly trenched by the channels into which the barren forms and observances of a dead Puritanism can pen a bitter temper and a fierce pride. She is an elderly matron who has worked hard, and got nothing by it except dominion and detestation in her sordid home, and an unquestioned reputation for piety and respectability among her neighbors, to whom drink and debauchery are still so much more tempting than religion and rectitude that they conceive goodness simply as self-denial. This conception is easily extended to others-denial, and finally generalized as covering everything disagreeable. So Mrs. Dudgeon, being exceedingly disagreeable, is held to be exceedingly good. Short of flat felony, she enjoys complete license except for amiable weaknesses of any sort, and is consequently, without knowing it, the most licentious woman in the parish on the strength of never having broken the seventh commandment or missed a Sunday at the Presbyterian church.

. . . . . .

"Suddenly there comes a tapping at the door, not loud enough to wake the sleepers. Then knocking, which disturbs Mrs. Dudgeon a little. Finally, the latch is tried; whereupon she springs up at once.

"*Mrs. Dudgeon (threateningly):* Well, why don't you open the door? *(She sees that the girl is asleep, and immediately raises a clamor of heartfelt vexation).* Well, dear, dear me! Now, this is—, *shaking her:* Wake up, wake up: do you hear?"

Mr. Pinero, on the other hand, prefers an austerer method, like that of the dramatists of France,—a fortunate country in which the habit of reading plays was never allowed to lapse, and in which the playwrights have always been conscientious in preparing library editions of their complete works. Mr. Pinero wisely eschews the shorthand of the prompt copy; but his indications of background and of action are summary, as though he chose to let his characters speak for themselves, and as though he wished to rely solely on his dialogue to convey his full intent. This sober presentation of the words of the play is not without advantages of its own, as the reader's attention is concentrated upon what the several characters say. But one may venture to doubt whether a more elaborate explanation would not be profitable for English readers at the present time, when they need to be allured into the acquiring of a new habit,—when they are to be coaxed into a new groove. One may venture to doubt whether

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the passages already quoted from Ibsen and from Mr. Shaw are not more likely to accomplish their purpose than a passage like the following taken from Mr. Pinero's "The Cabinet Minister":

> *"The scene is a conservatory built and decorated in Moorish style, in the house of the Rt. Hon. Sir Julian Twombley, M.P., Chesterfield Gardens, London. A fountain is playing, and tall palms lend their simple elegance to the elaborate Algerian magnificence of the place. The drawing-rooms are just beyond the curtained entrance. It is a May afternoon.*
>
> *"Brooke Twombley, a good-looking but insipid young man of about two-and-twenty, faultlessly dressed for the afternoon, enters, and sits dejectedly, turning over some papers."*

This much the professional playwrights must do if they hope to tempt the average reader to the perusal of their pieces; they must smooth the path of any one who is willing to embark on the novel enterprise of playreading; they must make the way straight before him. But the reader, in his turn, needs also to take a little trouble; and he must not only overcome the initial difficulty of enjoying a story set forth in bare dialogue, he must also train himself, as best he can, to visualize the action of the drama he has in hand. He will get more pleasure out of its perusal, if he is able to evoke, however faintly, the actual color of the scenes and the actual movement of the characters, as though the play was being acted before him. That is to say, he needs to summon all his imaginative sympathy to picture an actual performance, in his mind's eye, so to speak.

The reader needs often to be reminded that the masterpieces of the great dramatic poets were all written to be performed by actors, in a theatre, before an audience. None of them was prepared primarily for the reader, but only secondarily for him. It is in the theatre alone that the drama is truly alive; and there alone does it disclose itself in all its beauty. What Mr. Henry James says of Ibsen is equally true of Sophocles, of Shakespere, and of Molière,—that "it is impossible to read him without perceiving that merely book in hand we but half know him,—he addresses himself so substantially to representation." And therefore must we, book in hand, put out all our energy to imagine the black-and-white skeleton proffered by the printed page, bodied forth by flesh-and-blood figures, framed in the broad arch of the playhouse, wherein the drama had its birth and wherein it breathes most largely.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps it is impossible to do this completely; and to do it at all is difficult enough. Most readers lack the needful imagination, and most of them are also without a sufficient acquaintance with the art of the stage. Sir Walter Scott spoke for many another man of letters when he confessed that he felt "severely the want of knowledge of theatrical business," and when he admitted himself "inadequate to estimate those criticisms which rest on stage effect." Not only men of letters, but also men of the theatre, managers of experience and of intelligence, are unable to perceive in the book, and to foresee, the exact effect which a play will make on them when it comes to be performed. Yet the effort to visualize a performance, however insufficient may be the result, is ever its own reward, for it gives the willing reader just so much more pleasure, just so much more insight into the ultimate value of the book in hand.

It is a good augury for the immediate future of the English drama that the promising playwrights of our tongue are again taking thought of the reader, book in hand, and are now appealing once more to him as well as to the playgoer. Nothing is more likely to stimulate the ambition of our dramatists, to lead them to the choice of ampler themes, to nerve them to the utmost endeavor, to give them the hope that they may find favor also in the library after they have conquered in the theatre. But of these two victories there is no doubt which is the more important, and in which area a triumph is achieved with most difficulty. The play is, and has been, and always will be, written to be played, by actors, in a theatre, and before an audience; and this is why Shakespere and Molière were careless in collecting their masterpieces for posterity. They had succeeded in pleasing their contemporaries who flocked to see their plays performed. What could they wish for more? As M. Coquelin pointed out in the splendidly illuminative lecture on Molière and Shakespere which the incomparable comedian delivered in New York now nearly a score of years ago, these two great dramatists were indifferent to the printing of their works, because "they did not recognize these on paper. 'Tartuffe' and 'Hamlet' existed for them only before the footlights. It was only there that they felt their plays bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh."

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FUTURE OF THE BRITISH WEST INDIES.

BY W. P. LIVINGSTONE.

THE reduction of the British naval and military establishments in the West Indies, to a point which means the practical abandonment of the colonies as a factor in the scheme of Imperial defence, has brought up once more for discussion the value of the political relation which binds them to Great Britain. A few years ago, it was the acknowledged purpose of the Home Government to render both Jamaica and St. Lucia impregnable as naval stations, and up to a recent date large sums of money were being expended on the construction of barracks and fortifications. All new works have now, however, been stopped, the white troops are being withdrawn, and the military lands are being turned over to the local Governments or offered for sale.

This policy is, no doubt, largely dictated by the necessity for rearranging the strategic bases of the Empire in view of modern world-developments; but it is significant that it coincides with the growth of American power in the Caribbean. Previous to the war with Spain, the United States possessed no foothold in the West Indies: since then, her outposts have been extended halfway down the chain of islands, and the control of the main shipping routes in the region has passed into her hands. Two sites for naval stations have been acquired in Cuba. Bahia Honda is nearly opposite Key West, and both guard the entrance to the Gulf of Mexico. Guantanamo, an extensive stretch of sheltered water, will command the Windward Passage hitherto dominated by Jamaica. Puerto Rico and Culebra defend the Mona Passage. It is only a question of time ere Mole St. Nicolas on the Haitian side of the Windward route is secured, while Samana Bay, probably the finest harbor in the West Indies, is marked

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out for early American possession. The operation of the Monroe Doctrine will prevent St. Thomas, another valuable naval asset, from being transferred to any other Power than America; and it is not difficult to foresee that circumstances will necessitate the acquisition of an island off the South-American coast. This will complete the series of defensive posts, and give the United States the absolute mastery of the Caribbean Sea and all the approaches to the Panama Canal.

There cannot be any doubt that the cessation of Imperial activity in the British islands has been influenced by these actual and potential developments, and the effect has been, not unnaturally, to unsettle the minds of the inhabitants of the British West Indies, the more thoughtful of whom have also been revising the situation, and asking themselves if the time has not come when a radical change in the fundamental conditions of government is not essential for the future welfare of the islands. Ever since these became dependencies of the Crown, West Indians have clung, with more or less confidence, to the hope that their prosperity would eventually be established on a sound and permanent basis; but the conviction is steadily growing that, under the present régime, there is no prospect of any substantial change for the better taking place. Rightly or wrongly, it is maintained that, while the Home Government has provided a high-class and efficient administration, with all the adjuncts of an orderly civilization, it has failed to develop the resources and stimulate the industries of the islands, with the result that the public burdens are out of proportion to the elementary character of the people and their economic capacity and status. What has been accomplished within recent years, such as the abolition of the sugar bounties, the initiation of the direct fruit-trade with England, and the creation of the Imperial Department of Agriculture, has been due solely to the individual initiative of Mr. Chamberlain. The normal policy of the Colonial Office is to concern itself only with the routine of executive detail, and the general appearance of the islands undoubtedly supports the contention that they are suffering from neglect. They are splendidly endowed with natural wealth, yet the lives of their inhabitants are a continuous struggle with poverty and debt. Trinidad is the only island which at present suggests to the visitor the prevalence of activity and affluence. Government reports and statistics may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point to other and more favorable conclusions, but the whole talk of planters and merchants is of declining business, and of an increasingly gloomy outlook.

What is the cause of this perpetual dissatisfaction and reaching out towards some external source of stimulus and aid? The answer will be found to lie in the racial characteristics of the population. The great majority of the inhabitants are negroes and persons of mixed blood, who are incapable of independent progress. They can advance only under the pressure of the vigorous influences of northern civilization; without this contact they degenerate and regress. Some of the island administrations endeavor in a limited way to foster the spirit of self-help among them; but the process is too superficial and slow in its operation to show much appreciable result in the mass. Unlike the great self-governing colonies, which can be left to themselves, the West Indies require to be taken in hand, as the United States Government has set itself to make the most of Puerto Rico and the Philippines. The intelligent members of the community are fully aware of their position and of their need for the impact of a higher outside force upon their national existence; and, convinced that no improvement in their material condition is to be expected from a longer connection with the parent country, it is not surprising that they should be speculating on the possibility of a new relation being established. There are only two other courses open to them,—absorption in Canada or annexation to the United States.

For some years, there has been a disposition in many quarters to regard a political union with Canada as the most practicable solution of the difficulty. Canada has not hitherto been considered a factor in the New World. She has been looked upon as a dependency of Great Britain, occupying a position similar to that of the American colonies before the Revolution—a young country concerned mainly with questions of internal development and expansion. But, with the steady growth of her political autonomy, her increasing population, the rapid progress of her manufacturing industries, and an ambition that is almost Imperial, she is becoming a force to be reckoned with. While chiefly devoting her energy and capital to profitable local enterprise, she has been making bids for the trade of far-distant countries, and succeeding in capturing a share of it. So far, however, the smaller

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

markets of the West Indies have not attracted her to any extent. A number of individuals and companies have invaded the islands, and these have created a certain sentiment in favor of closer commercial ties. The Maritime Provinces of Canada, as the portions of the Dominion most likely to benefit from the arrangement, naturally support the idea, but the Canadian Government has never exhibited any anxiety to bring the matter within the range of practical discussion. When the last effort in this direction was made by Jamaica, the Hon. Sydney Olivier, then Colonial Secretary, was sent as a delegate to Ottawa empowered to arrange for a subsidized steamship service, but he found the officials so indifferent that nothing was accomplished. It is true that a preference of 33 1-3 per cent. has been granted to West-Indian sugars; but this has been retained by the Canadian refiners, and the planters derive no benefit from the concession.

Federation with Canada no doubt presents special advantages. The arrangement would cause little dislocation in the loyalty and attachment which the inhabitants naturally feel towards Great Britain, and would probably not be resented by the black population. It is claimed by those who advocate it that the result would be to simplify and cheapen administration, though the officials, whose view is, of course, colored by their prepossession in favor of England, combat this assumption. They assert that the public services would have to be maintained on practically the same lines as at present, and the same amount of revenue would have to be raised by taxation for the payment of the island debt, educational and medical facilities, and the relief of the poor. They admit that it might be possible to reduce the salaries of the Governors and higher officials, but otherwise the burdens of the community would not be lightened.

The main body of private responsible opinion throughout the West Indies, however, is opposed to the scheme. A closer and more vital connection with Canada would involve reciprocal trade and preferential tariffs, and this, it is believed, would lead to retaliation on the part of the United States which the Dominion would be powerless to resist or counteract. The latter does not possess the consuming capacity of its southern neighbor, and will not, for a long time to come, be able to provide a sufficiently large market to replace the one now available for the tropical products of the West Indies. Until that period arrives, West-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indian business men are not disposed to take any steps which might bring them into a suicidal fiscal conflict with the United States. Moreover, New York is considerably nearer than Canadian ports, the majority of the business interests of the West Indies are rooted there, and the methods and terms of New York houses are more advantageous to the mercantile community than those offered in Canada, while there are greater distribution facilities and a wider market for goods consigned on option. The matter has been publicly discussed by representative commercial bodies in a number of the colonies; and the general conclusion to be drawn from the opinions expressed is that, while improved trade relations with Canada may profitably be established, it is too early to look upon political union as a practical proposition.

The truth of the matter is that, despite all tendencies to the contrary, the West Indies are slowly but irresistibly drifting towards the United States, and will inevitably be drawn into organic connection with that country. The process is in line with natural law and economic necessity. Physically, they are part of the United States, and their trade flows thither, because in the United States they find, for the majority of their products, their nearest and most profitable market. If we take Jamaica, we find that over sixty-eight per cent. of its exports goes to the United States, while over forty per cent. of its imports is credited to the same country. It is relying more and more upon delicate and perishable produce, which comprises sixty per cent. of its total exports, and of this the greater proportion finds its way to the United States, the value of fruit alone being nearly six million dollars. The other colonies are very much in the same position. Yet, while thus commercially dependent on the United States, the relation subsisting between them is of the most precarious nature. Both have comparatively high tariffs, the United States imposing its tropical rates in the interest of home production, and the West Indies for the ostensible purpose of securing public revenue. In this respect, the latter find themselves in a peculiarly difficult position, loyalty prompting them to give the most favorable terms to England, and self-interest dictating that the demands of the United States should be granted in order to avoid the risk of retaliatory imposts. The smallest tax on bananas, for instance, would ruin Jamaica; that on oranges has made the industry unprofitable. A short time ago, the writer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rode through one of the finest orange-producing districts in Jamaica, and saw millions of the fruit dropping from the trees and lying rotting on the ground. The growers stated that they could obtain no sale for it, and it did not pay them to employ men to pick it up and cart it away as refuse. It is only a few years since the same island was panic-stricken by a report that America intended to penalize her produce, and the local Government was very glad to negotiate a convention which involved a large loss to the customs revenue. The islands suffer from the dread that, under the stress of party exigency in the United States, their relatively insignificant trade may be sacrificed and their industrial prospects blighted.

It is in view of such facts that very many West-Indians believe that the only possible hope for the islands lies in their cession to the United States, and in their securing, like Puerto Rico, a free entry for their produce into its natural market. There has never been any serious public consideration of the question, but one finds it privately advocated by planters and merchants everywhere. The chief reason for the absence of a responsible movement is the fact that the idea is thought to be unpopular among the mass of the people, who might boycott the individuals that supported it. The negroes are well aware of the inferior position occupied by the colored population in the United States, and it is believed that they would resist American domination, though there has never been any opportunity of testing their real sentiment in the matter. The struggle for subsistence with them, as with others, is gradually intensifying with their expanding tastes and requirements, and it is difficult to say what they would not risk in order to improve their material condition. While fully conscious of the freedom and justice they enjoy under the British rule, they are shrewd enough to know that the advent of Americans would mean abundance of employment and a greater circulation of money. A negro aptly described the general feeling when he said that he would like to work in America and sleep in England. One intelligent black artisan, a leader of his fellows, assured the writer that his race would not oppose annexation if the prohibition of lynching could be secured: he thought it likely, however, that the half-castes, who have more to lose from a social point of view, would incite the negroes to resist the proposal, and this opinion was echoed by many others in the various is-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lands. It is very probable that, if the United States could solve its black problem on satisfactory lines, there would be little objection on the part of the native population to the transfer.

Neither in the United States nor in England does the question of the ultimate disposal of the colonies excite much attention. The average American is inclined to believe that the nation has already absorbed a greater number of the colored race than it can digest, while many deprecate the further extension of colonial enterprise. Few, probably, would object to the possession of Jamaica, the strategic importance of which, in relation to the Panama Canal, is generally recognized. This island has also become a popular winter resort with all classes of Americans, and American capital has been largely invested in it, one company owning extensive tracts of fertile lands and practically controlling the fruit trade with the United States. The decision in such matters, however, does not always rest with the citizens of a country: a government is sometimes forced into new paths of development, and compelled to accept wider responsibilities and duties, in order to safeguard the national interests; and it is clear that the United States is being drawn into a policy which will necessitate further territorial acquisition in the Caribbean. In England, there is equal indifference on the subject among the mass of the people. To many, the famed beauty of the islands and their splendid historic background appeal with a force which one can readily understand and sympathize with; but the majority of the taxpayers, who are often called upon to contribute towards their upkeep without commensurate benefit, appear to be ready to acquiesce in any arrangement for their transfer, if the inhabitants themselves wish to enter into it. In official circles, the opinion grows that it is useless to attempt to meet, by artificial means, a state of things due to a fundamental twist in the political and commercial relations of the islands, but no statesman has been bold enough to make the formal proposal that they should be ceded to the Power to which they naturally belong. The effect of such a suggestion from a responsible source is purely problematical. It might be received with universal approbation in the West Indies; it might, on the other hand, set the islands in flame. What is certain is that, if any change is to be effected, the initial impulse must come from the colonists themselves.

W. P. LIVINGSTONE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MOST-FAVORED-NATION RELATIONS BETWEEN GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES.

BY N. I. STONE, TARIFF EXPERT IN THE BUREAU OF STATISTICS.

THE pending tariff changes in the German Empire have given rise to renewed discussion of the commercial relations between that country and the United States. One of the results of this discussion, carried on in the light of the diplomatic negotiations between the two countries in the last twenty years, has been to call into question the nature of the most-favored-nation relations between the two countries. For hardly any of our commercial treaties has given rise to such divergence of views on the part of the respective Governments as the one which serves to-day as the basis for our commercial relations with the German Empire.

There are two reasons to account for this situation: first, the fact that the treaty in question was concluded by the United States, not with the German Empire, but with the kingdom of Prussia; second, the difference between the German and American interpretations of the most-favored-nation principle.

As to the first: The treaty at present in force was concluded with the King of Prussia on May 1st, 1828. Article XV of the treaty of 1828 provides that "the treaty shall continue in force for twelve years," and, in the absence of an official notification on the part of either party of its intention to terminate the same, "it shall remain binding for one year beyond that time, and so on until the expiration of twelve months which will follow a similar notification, whatever the time at which it may take place."

On January 18th, 1871, Prussia ceased to be an independent State so far as its foreign relations are concerned, and became part of the German Empire. However, since no declaration of an intention to terminate the treaty, as provided

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Article XV, had ever come from either side, the treaty is still considered to be in force. Yet, for purposes of international dealings, Prussia has ceased to exist; moreover, that kingdom has no longer any jurisdiction over the regulation of its foreign commerce, since tariff legislation has been vested in the Imperial Government. Articles 4 and 35 of the Constitution of the German Empire provide that "all matters relating to customs," as well as "legislation as to customs tariffs and commerce," fall within the jurisdiction of the Empire. According to Article 33 of the Constitution, the Empire "forms one customs and commercial territory." The Imperial Government, in line with these provisions, has considered that the treaty with Prussia, as well as the similar treaties between the United States and the Hanseatic republics of Lubeck, Bremen and Hamburg of 1827, and the Kingdom of Hanover of 1846, have now come within the province of Imperial responsibility, and are therefore applicable to the entire Empire. All the claims and discussions of the most-favored-nation relations on the part of the Imperial Government proceed from this assumption.

On the other hand, the United States Government has generally insisted on the strict construction of the original wording of the treaty of 1828. Said Secretary Gresham in 1894, in his otherwise favorable reply to the German protest against the countervailing duty on sugar created by the Wilson act: "The stipulations of these two articles [of the treaty of 1828] place the commercial intercourse of the United States and Prussia, *not the entire German Empire,* on the most-favored-nation basis." Similar views were expressed by his successors, Secretaries Olney and Sherman.

So much for the status of the treaty. As regards the scope of its application, the following two articles, referred to above by Secretary Gresham, form the basis of the most-favored-nation relations between the two countries:

"ARTICLE V—No higher or other duties shall be imposed on the importation into the United States of any article the produce or manufacture of Prussia, and no higher or other duties shall be imposed on the importation into the Kingdom of Prussia of any article the produce or manufacture of the United States, than are or shall be payable on the like article, being the produce or manufacture of any other foreign country. . . .

"ARTICLE IX—If either party shall hereafter grant to any other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation any particular favor in navigation or commerce, it shall immediately become common to the other party, freely, where it is freely granted to such other nation, or on yielding the same compensation when the grant is conditional."

The Germans, following the general diplomatic practice of European countries, have held that the principle laid down in Article V is the regulating factor in most-favored-nation relations between two countries; that is to say, whenever Germany reduces any of her rates of duty on any products coming from a certain country, it unconditionally and immediately extends the same rates to all other countries with which it has most-favored-nation treaties.

The United States, on the contrary, holds that the conditions laid down in Clause IX have a modifying effect on Clause V; that is to say, whenever the United States grants certain reductions of duty to a foreign country in return for similar concessions, these reductions are not extended to favored nations, unless the latter are willing to reciprocate in a similar way.

It is about this difference in interpretation of the principle that the contentions between Germany and the United States have largely centred. To what extent each Government has held consistently to its point of view of the subject will appear from the following review of their relations.

I.

The first test of the most-favored-nation principle under the treaty of 1828, in its application to import duties, did not occur until 1885. On February 10th of that year, Prince Bismarck took occasion, in the course of a debate in the Reichstag, to make the following statement:

"The previous speaker assumed that the United States does not belong to the most-favored nations. As a matter of fact, it does not on the basis of treaties with the Empire, but of those she has with Prussia and other German states which cannot be kept distinct from the Empire. Practically, we treat each other as most-favored nations, a circumstance which furnishes us the reason to claim the same advantages—say, for our sugar imports—in the United States as those granted to Cuba and Porto Rico in the treaty between Spain on behalf of her colonies and the United States, should that treaty be put into effect."

Ten days later, the same principle was recognized by the German Bundesrath, in the ordinance extending the lower rates

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

granted to imports of rye from Spain to the most-favored nations, among which the United States was expressly included. Whether that was merely a shrewd move on the part of the Iron Chancellor, made with a view to creating a precedent which would strengthen the claims of Germany for most-favored-nation treatment for its sugar by the United States under the provision of our treaty with Spain, in the event of its ratification, may be left an open question. But the question is more than justified in view of the fact that, two years previous to that, when Germany had no occasion to make use of its most-favored-nation privileges in this country, the United States was not treated in the same manner. On October 24th, 1883, the Bundesrath issued an ordinance similar to the one mentioned above, extending the concessions granted to Italy and Spain, in the recently concluded commercial treaties, to the most-favored nations, among which the name of the United States did not appear.

No sooner had Chancellor Caprivi succeeded Prince Bismarck than a new occasion presented itself for testing the most-favored-nation principle in the commercial relations between the two countries. On October 6th, 1890, the McKinley Tariff went into force in the United States. Section 3 of that act placed in the hands of the President the power of retaliation against any country levying discriminating duties on United States products, by authorizing him to impose certain duties on sugar, molasses, coffee, tea and hides. All of these products were placed on the free list. The section was designed principally to secure special concessions from South-American countries for our own products, in return for duty-free admission of the products just mentioned. As Germany, however, had built up an important sugar trade with this country, she was vitally interested in securing duty-free admission of her sugar to the United States.

In the following year, the German Government inaugurated a series of negotiations with several European countries, with a view to the conclusion of commercial treaties for the reciprocal reduction of import duties in their respective tariffs. If the German Government was still of the opinion expressed by Bismarck, that the most-favored-nation principle was the regulating factor in the commercial relations between the United States and the German Empire, there was no other course left for it to pursue but to follow the precedent Bismarck and the Bundesrath had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

set in 1885, and to extend to the United States the reduced rates granted to the various European countries.

Germany, however, adopted an entirely different course. In a communication, dated at Saratoga, August 22nd, 1891, the German *Chargé d'Affaires* in this country addressed the Hon. John W. Foster, informing him of the intention of the German Government to remove "the prohibition, promulgated on sanitary grounds in the year 1883, of the importation of hogs, pork and sausage of American origin, in view of recent American legislation for the inspection of meats intended for export." At the same time, the letter stated that "the Imperial Government, in making this declaration, bases its action upon the supposition that, after the abolition of the aforesaid German prohibition of importation, the President of the United States of America will no longer have any occasion for the exercise, as regards the German Empire, of the discretionary powers conferred upon him by the Fifty-first Congress" (that is, under Section 3 of the McKinley act). To emphasize further the fact that the whole transaction was to be in the nature of a bargain, the letter concluded with the following statement:

> "The Imperial Government thinks that it has the greater reason for this assumption, since it is prepared to grant to the United States of America the same reductions in customs duties on agricultural products that have been granted by it (or still are so) to Austria-Hungary and other states during the negotiations for the conclusion of a treaty of commerce that are now being conducted by Germany."

Any reference to the most-favored-nation clause which, according to Bismarck's declaration and German diplomatic practice and precedents, entitled the United States to the reduction of duties granted to Austria-Hungary, is conspicuous by its absence in the letter quoted above. On the contrary, the Imperial Government intimates that "it is prepared" to grant us lower rates, provided the United States will admit German sugar free, making it plain that the concessions are to be mutual. Furthermore, it is not even prepared to grant us all the reductions in duties conceded to Austria-Hungary, but those affecting "agricultural products" only.

The agreement finally concluded between the two countries, proclaimed February 1st, 1892, and known as the Saratoga Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vention, was in every respect in conformity with the propositions laid down in the letter of the German *Chargé d'Affaires,* and only agricultural products were included in the list of articles to be admitted to Germany at reduced rates of duty.

That the German Government disregarded its own precedents and avowed principles in the premises, was admitted later on by Baron Marshall von Bieberstein, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who, in a speech before the Reichstag, delivered December 14th, 1894, said:

> "*We granted these concessions to the United States without any equivalent in return,* because we were bound by treaty to do so, since, by virtue of Articles V and IX of the Treaty of 1828 concluded between Prussia and the United States, we were bound to extend unconditional most-favored-nation treatment, according to the construction which we have always placed upon that treaty. . . . However, *the preceding speaker is mistaken when he believes we made a free, unconditional gift to the United States* by extending to them, through most-favored-nation treatment, the concession granted to Austria-Hungary. On the contrary, we have secured certain guarantees by the exchange of notes of August 22nd, 1891."

It is only necessary to read in succession the two italicized passages in the above utterance to note the striking contradiction in the speech of the German Secretary. As a matter of fact, neither the most-favored-nation principle nor the treaty of 1828 is in any way, directly or indirectly, mentioned in the notes referred to by the Secretary.

The Saratoga Convention was based, as we have seen, on reciprocity. In return for the German concessions, the United States granted duty-free admission of sugar and a few other products. When, in 1894, the Wilson act removed sugar from the free list and repealed Section 3 of the McKinley act providing for reciprocity, the United States virtually withdrew the concessions it had granted in the Saratoga Convention, and thereby terminated the agreement *de facto,* although no official declaration was made to that effect. Besides placing sugar on the dutiable list, the Wilson act provided for an additional duty of one-tenth of a cent per pound on sugar imported from countries paying an export bounty. In two communications, dated July 16th and August 28th, 1894, addressed by the German Ambassador to the United States, he took occasion to protest against the imposition of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countervailing duty as "in harmony neither with existing stipulations nor with those tendencies which the exchange of notes of August 22nd, 1891, called forth."

According to the view of the German Government:

"The payment of a bounty is a purely domestic matter, and it is not to be considered in connection with the establishment of duties between states which, like Germany and the United States, sustain the relation of the most-favored nation toward each other. The United States might, for instance, with the same reason, assert that German manufacturers in any particular branch of industry paid lower taxes than elsewhere, and then, in order to bring about a so-called equalization, levy a discriminating duty on the German product concerned, on its importation into an American port. It is quite evident that such a view of the case would render the most-favored-nation clause altogether illusory.

"The Imperial Government feels conscious that it has always conscientiously fulfilled the duties rendered incumbent upon it by the most-favored-nation clause, and it consequently deems itself authorized to expect similar action on the part of the United States of America."

Secretary Gresham thought the points raised by Germany well taken, and advised the President accordingly. On a later occasion, however, when Germany reiterated its protest, Attorney-General Olney pointed out the inconsistency of the German views, recalling the fact that "Germany expressly declared, at the International Sugar Conference of 1888, that the export bounty on sugar of one country might be countervailed by the import duty on sugar of another, without causing any discrimination which could be deemed a violation of the terms of the most-favored-nation clause."

The protest of the German Government, although transmitted by President Cleveland for favorable consideration to Congress, was not heeded by the latter, and the countervailing duty on bounty-fed sugar was applied to the German article.

However, as the Cuban insurrection crippled the sugar industry of that island, the German exports to this country continued to grow, in spite of the increased duty. Nothing was therefore heard from that country again until the Dingley bill raised the countervailing duty to the amount of the export bounty actually paid by any country.

On April 5th and July 28th, 1897, the German Ambassador addressed the Secretary of State, renewing the protest of his predecessor, made in 1894, and embodying it in his own, as against

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an action which "is incompatible, both with the most-favored-nation rights that are secured to German products by the treaties in force . . . and with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of August 22nd, 1891," and intimating that, unless the protests were heeded, his Government would "be confronted with the question whether those advantages should be further continued which it had hitherto extended to the United States by applying to the importations from that country, especially with regard to its agricultural products, the minimum tariff. . . ."

While the German Ambassador was urging his protest at Washington, Baron von Marshall, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, made the following statement in the German Reichstag, May 3rd, 1897:

"When the Imperial Government concluded the commercial treaty with Austria-Hungary in 1891, it did not doubt for a moment that it was duty-bound to extend unconditionally to the United States the tariff reductions granted to Austria-Hungary. If, in spite of this clear situation, negotiations were entered upon with the United States which subsequently led to the Saratoga exchange of notes, it was exclusively due to the fact that at the time . . . the McKinley act gave rise to grave doubts as to whether our view as to the right in the matter was reciprocally shared by the other side. . . . In order to secure ourselves in this regard, we entered into negotiations, the result of which was embodied in the exchange of notes at Saratoga. This shows that no new rights, no new obligations, were created by the above exchange of notes . . .; that, in other words, the ultimate aim thereof was to clearly define what form the existing most-favored-nation relations, based on treaty rights, would assume when applied to the new commercial legislation of the two countries."

In other words, realizing that the Saratoga agreement could no longer stand as a reciprocity agreement, the German Foreign Secretary tried to construe it now as merely a declaratory statement, defining more precisely the most-favored-nation relations between the two countries. This view the United States Government refused to entertain, declaring that the agreement, being clearly a reciprocity arrangement, was no longer in force, with the repeal of the McKinley act.

The last occasion for an exchange of views on the most-favored-nation relations between the two countries was furnished by the "Reciprocal Commercial Agreement" concluded between the United States and France, May 28th, 1898. By the terms of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that agreement, each of the contracting parties granted to the other reduced rates of duty on a limited number of articles, the American concessions being based on Section 3 of the Dingley act. Germany now claimed that the same concessions should be extended to German products under the most-favored-nation clause.

Following its usual policy, the United States refused to grant these reductions of duty unconditionally, but expressed its willingness to do so on a basis of reciprocity. This offer finally prevailed, and resulted in the conclusion of a similar agreement with Germany in 1900, by which, in return for the concessions authorized by Section 3 of the Dingley act, Germany extended to the United States her entire minimum tariff.

II.

Having reviewed the German attitude on the subject, we may now turn to the American aspect of the case. I shall confine myself to those cases only which directly affected the scope of application of the most-favored-nation principle.

The first commercial treaty that the United States ever concluded was that with France in 1778. In 1792, Jefferson, in his capacity of Secretary of State, reporting to the President on the negotiations with Spain for a treaty of commerce and navigation, expressed himself against granting any special reductions of duties to Spanish products for this reason: "If we grant favor to the wines and brandies of Spain, then Portugal and France will demand the same; and, in order to create an equivalent, Portugal may lay a duty on our fish and grain, and France a prohibition on our whale oil, *the removal of which will be proposed as an equivalent.*" This passage clearly proves that our first Secretary of State regarded the clause of the French treaty corresponding to Article IX in our treaty with Prussia as having a modifying effect on Clause V. As Jefferson took a direct part in the drawing up of the early treaties, and was moreover associated in his official capacity with the signers of the first treaty in which Clauses V and IX were embodied, it is apparent that what is known as the American interpretation of the most-favored-nation principle is coextensive with the existence of the United States as a nation.

In 1894, Germany protested against the imposition by the United States of a duty on German salt as in conflict with Germany's "rights of the most-favored nation." The matter was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

submitted to the Attorney-General for an opinion. Denying the claims made by Germany, he said among other things:

"The most-favored-nation clause of our treaties with foreign Powers has, from the foundation of our Government, been invariably construed, both as not forbidding any internal regulations necessary for the protection of our home industries, and as permitting commercial concessions, and to which no other country is entitled except upon rendering the same equivalents. Thus, Mr. Jefferson, when Secretary of State in 1792, said of treaties exchanging the rights of the most-favored nation that they leave each party free to make what internal regulations they please and to give what preference they find expedient to native merchants, vessels and productions. In 1817, Mr. John Quincy Adams, acting in the same official capacity, took the ground that the most-favored-nation clause only covered gratuitous favors and did not touch concession for equivalents, expressed or implied. Mr. Clay, Mr. Livingston, Mr. Evarts and Mr. Bayard, when at the head of the Department of State, have each given official expression to the same view. It has also received the sanction of the Supreme Court in more than one well-considered decision."

It will be apparent from what has been said that the United States has been consistent throughout in its interpretation of the most-favored-nation principle, although radically at variance in this respect with nearly all the European countries. A noted exception to this rule is furnished by the American-Swiss treaty of 1850, but even that exception could never stand the test of practical application. On June 29th, 1898, the Swiss Minister to the United States addressed the American Government asking it to extend to Swiss imports into the United States the tariff concessions which had just been granted to France. He based his request on the ground that the treaty of November 25th, 1850, entitled Switzerland to the most-favored-nation treatment, and he called attention to the fact that the most-favored-nation clause specified in Articles 8, 9, 10 and 12 of that treaty was "absolutely unlimited."

To this, Mr. Day, then Acting Secretary of State, took exception on the ground "that it is and always has been the view of this Government that a reciprocity treaty is a bargain and not a favor, and that it therefore does not come within the scope of the most-favored-nation clause." But after a further exchange of notes, Secretary Hay, who had in the mean time succeeded Judge Day in office, in his historic reply on No-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vember 21st, 1898, was led, upon "examination . . . of the original correspondence of the American negotiator with his Government," to admit "the equity of the reclamation" presented by the Swiss Government; however, since the treaty with Switzerland, if allowed to stand, would constitute "an exception to the otherwise uniform policy of the United States," he believed it would be necessary "to arrest the operation of the treaty of 1850, or of the clause of said treaty" which referred to the most-favored-nation treatment.

The Swiss claim for reduced rates was accordingly granted; but, after failure to arrive at a common understanding, the clauses referred to were finally abrogated, March 8th, 1899.

Thus, the exceptional most-favored-nation treaty with Switzerland had to be repealed at the first practical test to which it was put. The step taken by the United States Government was unavoidable, if it was to adhere to the established policy of this country. To have left the treaty in force would have made us liable, under Clause IX, to extend *freely* to all favored nations any concessions we might make in the future to some country on a reciprocal basis. This would signify a complete reversal of the historic policy of the United States.

III.

A good deal is to be said in favor of either construction of the most-favored-nation principle. There has been quite a tendency, manifesting itself of late among economic writers in Europe in favor of the American system, as the more expedient and better fitted to protect the interests of a country. A strong argument on the American side is that to extend gratuitously to one country what has been purchased by another country at the cost of equivalent concessions, is manifestly unfair to the latter. To this the advocates of the European view rejoin that the injustice is more apparent than real. If the discriminations were made against one country only, the American argument would be unanswerable. But, when the rule is made applicable to all countries alike, all are benefited, and there is no discrimination. The same is true when the matter is considered from the point of view of the country which grants the concessions. Under the American system, a country which has concessions to make will be able to exact equivalent concessions from every country which desires to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obtain them; while, under the European system, once the concessions are granted to one country, they must be extended gratis to all other countries included among the most-favored nations. On the other hand, the rule, being universally applied, works both ways, and every country becomes not only a dispenser of free favors, but a recipient as well.

There is another and far more important aspect of the question urged by the advocates of unlimited most-favored-nation treatment. Under the American construction of the most-favored-nation principle, a party to a commercial treaty can never be certain as to whether the provisions stipulated therein for safeguarding its interests will not be upset by some new treaty subsequently entered into by the other party with some third country. The United States might, for example, grant a reduced rate on textiles to Germany; if it saw fit, after the conclusion of that treaty, to grant a still lower rate on the same article to France, this obvious discrimination against Germany would be perfectly legitimate under the American construction of the most-favored-nation treatment, and Germany would not be able to get the reduced rate granted to France, except by new bargaining with the United States. Although it actually never occurred in the history of this country, the possibility of such discrimination, which is obviously at variance with the spirit of most-favored-nation practice, is entirely out of the question under the European system of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment.

With the increasing importance of our commercial intercourse with foreign nations, the divergence of the two systems becomes more painfully impressed upon the commercial interests of the latter. The first impulse on their part has been to accept the American construction for their dealings with the United States, while retaining their own in the intercourse between European nations. This may serve to explain the inconsistencies and the vacillations in the otherwise settled commercial policy of Germany, whenever it had to be applied to the United States. However, as pointed out by the late Secretary Hay, such a procedure on their part is impossible, as it would be in conflict with their treaties with this country now in force. Article IX of the treaty with Prussia says that any favor granted by one of the contracting parties to another country shall be extended to the other party "freely, where it is freely granted to such other nation, or on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yielding the same compensation when the grant is conditional." As every European nation, when making concessions to one country, is bound to extend those concessions *freely* to the other European nations, under their construction of the most-favored-nation principle, we are also entitled to the free enjoyment of the same under article IX.

An illustration from current history will make this clear. Germany has just concluded commercial reciprocity treaties with the following seven countries: Austria-Hungary, Russia, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Roumania and Servia, all of which gave something in return for those concessions. If Germany stopped there, we could not claim the benefit of the reduced rates unless we were willing to make reciprocal concessions. But, under her most-favored-nation treaties with Great Britain, as well as with several other countries, Germany will extend these concessions to Great Britain, France and several other countries *freely*. This gives the United States the right to claim the benefit of the reduced rates, without giving anything in return. On the other hand, in 1898 we concluded a commercial agreement with France, by which we granted to the latter certain reductions of duty in return for equivalent concessions. When Great Britain claimed the same favor for its products, under the most-favored-nation clause, we refused to grant it. Germany and other countries desiring to obtain the concessions granted by us to France had to conclude special reciprocity treaties with this country, while Great Britain, having no concessions to offer, continues to pay higher rates of duty on certain imports to the United States than other countries, which treat us far less liberally.

It goes without saying that the Europeans are reluctant to accept this situation indefinitely; and, unless the United States should see fit to modify its construction in conformity with the modern European practice, the only way the Europeans see out of the dilemma is to follow the example we set in the case of Switzerland,—namely, to repeal their most-favored-nation treaties with the United States.

Such is the drift of discussion now actively going on in Europe on the subject. What the probability is of either alternative taking shape in the near future remains to be seen.

N. I. Stone.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PENDING SHIPPING LEGISLATION.

BY W. E. HUMPHREY, OF THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THERE is pending in Congress, now being debated in the Senate, a bill that should appeal to the commercial interests, the patriotism and the pride of the American people. The object of this bill is to restore our flag to the seas.

The condition of our foreign shipping had aroused the most serious apprehension of Presidents McKinley and Roosevelt. Each urged Congress to do something to rehabilitate it.

On the 28th of April, 1904, in accordance with the recommendation in the Message of President Roosevelt of December 7, 1903, an act was passed by Congress creating a Merchant Marine Commission, consisting of five Senators and five Representatives. The duty of this Commission, as defined by the Act, was to investigate the condition of our shipping and report to Congress what legislation, if any, was necessary for the development of our Merchant Marine and American Commerce.

Conditions.—This Commission held meetings in all the principal seaports of the United States. Our foreign trade last year amounted to more than $2,240,000,000, the balance of trade in our favor exceeding $400,000,000; yet, of this vast trade only about seven per cent. was carried under the American flag. More than $500,000, in gold, each day is taken from the Treasury and paid to the foreigner for carrying our commerce. Ninety per cent. of this vast sum is wages paid to foreign labor. Our flag has practically disappeared from the sea, and, except upon a battle-ship or private yacht it is unknown in most of the ports of the world. During the year 1903, not one vessel flying the Stars and Stripes, engaged in the foreign trade, was seen in the port of Philadelphia—the second port of the country. There is but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one port in America where more tonnage is carried in American than in foreign bottoms, and that is the extreme Northwest port of the United States,—Puget Sound.

This nation to-day, with all its vast wealth, unlimited resources and mighty commerce, has actually 108,000 tons less engaged in foreign trade than it had ninety-five years ago. Within the last two years, Germany alone, with a population of only 53,000,000 has built more tonnage than the entire tonnage of this country. We have naval vessels to-day that we are not able to furnish with crews. If war should come to-morrow, we would have magnificent vessels of war without men to man them. Had we lost a single first-class fighting ship in our brief war with Spain, we could not have furnished officers and crew for another. These are some of the alarming, humiliating and discreditable conditions which the Commission found.

Why Our Merchant Marine has Declined.—The cause of the decline of our merchant marine was made plain to this Commission by the testimony given before it. It costs from 40 to 100 per cent. more to build an American ship than a foreign one of the same class. It costs from 20 to 40 per cent. more to operate an American than a foreign ship. All other countries, with any attempt at commerce, pay subsidies. One concrete, graphic illustration eloquently tells the story of the rapid disappearance of American shipping. The Boston Steamship Company has a fleet of five magnificent vessels running from Seattle to the Orient. Starting from the same wharves, bound for the same Oriental ports, is a line of Japanese ships consisting of three vessels. Directly on their way to the sea, this American line comes into competition with a line of British steamers, consisting of three vessels running from Vancouver, B. C. Character of ship considered, the Japanese owner has one-half less, and the British one-third less, invested than the American owner. The cost of running each of these foreign lines is at least twenty per cent. less than that of the American vessels. Added to this tremendous handicap the Japanese line receives an annual subsidy of $333,500; the English line $300,000, while the United States last year paid to the American line of five vessels the proud sum of $4,935. Against such fearful odds as these no human endeavor can long prevail.

Free Ships.—The facts developed by these hearings destroyed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many preconceived opinions and dearly beloved theories. When the Commission was formed, some of its members believed that the remedy was free ships. At the hearings, practically every ship-owner and shipping interest in America was asked: If given the opportunity would they purchase foreign ships, other conditions remaining the same as they now are? The one answer given was, No. Invariably they declared that, if given the ships for nothing, they could not operate them at a profit. This statement was vividly corroborated by what the Commission saw, for in many ports were found good vessels, fitted for the foreign trade, out of commission; indefinitely swinging at anchor, where they had been driven by the foreign subsidized vessels.

Discriminating Duties.—This was the most deeply cherished and most firmly believed in of all the preconceived remedies by the members of the Commission. The majority of the Commission believed in the beginning that discriminating duties would be the solution of the problem. But it was found that forty-seven per cent. of our imports were on the free list. The Democratic members of the Commission, true to the ancient doctrine of free trade, could not consent to a duty on articles already free. The Republican doctrine had always been against a duty on non-competitive articles, and as most of this forty-seven per cent. was of that class, the traditions of both great parties forbade discriminating duties. On exports, of course, no discriminating duties could be laid; and this was the traffic which it was most desired to increase.

When the Commission reached the Pacific at Puget Sound, it discovered that, if a ten-per-cent. discrimination on imports were to be made in favor of American vessels, it would amount to only $70 each. Or, in other words, one of the Boston Steamship Company's great steamers of ten thousand tons would receive the tremendous advantage of $70 for a twelve thousand mile voyage, probably enough to pay the second cook.

After the meeting at Seattle, the first on the Pacific, the theory of discriminating duties was abandoned by the Commission.

The Navy.—In recent years four nations by great expenditures have, theoretically, become great naval Powers—Germany, Russia, Japan and the United States. Two of these nations, Germany and Japan, realizing the futility and the folly of a navy without trained sailors and without auxiliary reserves, as they built a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

navy built a great merchant fleet. The United States and Russia are the only nations that have committed the inexcusable and costly blunder of trying to create a navy without men to command it and without auxiliary ships to support it.

The sunken and captured vessels of Russia's paper navy tell in graphic story her costly and humiliating mistake. It was the subsidized ships of Japan that carried her troops and supplies to Manchuria and made possible her brilliant victories on land; and the trained seamen from the subsidized vessels of Japan manned the fighting ships that destroyed the Russian navy.

The subsidy bill under which Japan has built her great merchant marine passed her legislative body by unanimous vote. Will the United States profit by the wisdom of Japan or the blunders of Russia? Unless we do, the $100,000,000 annually spent for our navy is worse than wasted. We have already more ships completed than we have men to command. We have no auxiliary fleet. We are in a condition to-day as bad as was Russia at the beginning of her late war.

The Army.—In our war with Spain, we exposed our troops to great peril and distressing hardships in getting them to Cuba. After twenty days of effort, and after all the American vessels on the Atlantic had been secured, we only had sufficient to carry about 10,000 troops. That this fleet arrived in safety was entirely due to chance. This expedition, according to a report of the Department of War just made public, could only justify its starting by its safe arrival. To-day, we are utterly powerless to protect our foreign possessions in case of war. We have no American ships to carry troops or supplies, and the law of nations, if it were otherwise possible, prevents us from securing foreign ships. If any country wants to fight with us, she will have to seize one of our possessions, and then kindly give us time to get ready. The often-heard boast that we are to-day a "World-Power" is grotesquely egoistical.

The Foreigner Controls Our Commerce.—It must not be forgotten that, with a complete monopoly of our carrying-trade in the hands of the foreigner, we are helpless to defeat any combination or trust that might be formed against our commercial interest. Lest such statement might provoke a smile of incredulity from the enemies of American shipping, it may be stated that a combination of this character has not only been contem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plated, but now actually exists on the Pacific Coast among the foreign sail-vessels. These vessels have entered into an agreement that while from a foreign port each vessel may charge such rate as it sees fit, from American ports no vessel is permitted to carry freight for a less price than that fixed by the combine, and the rate so fixed is considerably higher than the prevailing rate when such combine was formed. This combination of foreign vessels, upon which by our own acts we are now almost entirely dependent, is a disgraceful menace to American commerce. It shows that our foreign commerce to-day is entirely at the mercy of foreign nations. During the little Boer War, England withdrew a sufficient number of ships to increase freight rates from some of our ports 150 per cent. Every industry felt the effect. On the Pacific Coast, it reduced the price of wheat of the American farmer twenty-five cents per bushel.

What would be our condition to-day in case of war between England and Germany, or between either of them and any other great nation? Our foreign markets would be paralyzed; our farm products would rot in the field; the machinery would rust in our mills; factories would close their doors; labor would be forced into idleness; there would be want and suffering beyond description. Industrially we would suffer all the horrors and consequences of war. Can any candid judgment contend that shipping is the only industry in America which is interested in American commerce being carried in American ships?

Failure of the Republican Party.—The one conspicuous and disgraceful failure of the Republican party is the present humiliating condition of our merchant marine. This condition is entirely due to the system of protection as applied and retained by the Republican party. Every other industry has been protected from the deadly curse of foreign cheap labor. But the shipping industry, wholly unprotected and subjected to the fiercest and most direct foreign competition of all, on the one hand, has been compelled, on the other, to employ high-class protected labor to build and to operate its ships. If this country had absolute free trade in all industries and in all commodities, notwithstanding the handicap of subsidy, our shipping would care for itself. If it has extended to it the same measure of protection that is extended to other industries, it will flourish.

Bill Reported by the Commission.—The bill reported by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Commission provides for the payment of subventions to ten mail-lines, to be established as follows: Three from the Atlantic Coast, one to Brazil, one to Argentina, and one to South Africa; four from the Gulf of Mexico to Brazil, Mexico, Isthmus of Panama and Cuba, respectively; three from the Pacific, one to Mexico, Central America and the Isthmus of Panama, one to China, Japan, and the Philippines *via* Hawaii, and one direct to China, Japan and the Philippines. For these lines the maximum compensation under the bill is: Atlantic, $1,050,000; Gulf, $475,000; Pacific, $1,140,000—a total maximum of $2,665,000.

The bill also provides a compensation of $217,000 to the Oceanic line between San Francisco and New Zealand and Australia.

The policy of mail subventions is not a new one in the United States. The most important contract of this character was consummated during the administration of Grover Cleveland. This feature of the bill received the unanimous indorsement of the members of the Commission, both Democrats and Republicans. The vessels receiving these compensations must not only carry the mails, but the ships in the new lines must be built under the direction of the Navy Department with reference to their use in time of war, and all vessels receiving such aid must also carry an increasing proportion of their men who are naval volunteers. The other feature of compensation provided for by the bill is the payment of $5 per gross ton to any vessel, steam or sail, of any size, engaged for a year or more in the foreign trade; if engaged for a shorter time than one year, they receive less compensation. No vessel can receive this subvention for a longer period than ten years. The special object of this section of the bill was to help the slow cargo ships—the pioneers of commerce, the "delivery wagons" of the seas. No vessel receiving mail subventions can participate in this tonnage compensation.

Arguments Against the Bill.—Two arguments are most frequently urged against the bill, although the first of these, that our people have such opportunities on land that they have not seen fit to turn their attention to the sea, hardly merits the dignity of being called a reason or an argument. The fierce struggle for existence of our few remaining ships, and the millions of American money invested in foreign ships, certainly dispose of this statement. But the argument most used and most relied on by the enemies of this measure, both foreign and domestic, is:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the foreigner can do our carrying cheaper, why not permit him to do it? This theory is and ever has been the foundation of the doctrine of free trade. This doctrine has been met and answered by every protectionist in the Republic, from Alexander Hamilton to William McKinley. In recent years this argument was the one advanced in opposition to placing a tariff on tin-plate, and it has been at various times advanced against every protected article that ever appeared on a tariff schedule; and the history of every article upon which a protective tariff has ever been placed has demonstrated the falseness of the theory. If this argument be sound, the whole system of protection rests on a false foundation. A Democrat can take the affirmative of this proposition with consistency, but the Republican who does so is at war with all traditions and principles of his party.

Can the Foreigner Do Our Carrying More Cheaply?—We have protected for many years our manufactures, and we can produce manufactured articles more cheaply than any other nation. We protect agriculture, and the products of the soil are produced more cheaply here than anywhere else. We have protected our railroads by enormous subsidies and by immense land grants, and our railway-rates are the cheapest in the world; and yet, in each of these industries, the labor employed therein is the best-paid labor of its class upon earth, and capital invested therein receives a fair return.

United States shipping in coastwise-trade and on the Great Lakes is absolutely protected from foreign competition, yet the freight-rates upon the Lakes and in our coastwise-trade are to-day, and for many years have been, the lowest in all the history of commerce; and let it not be forgotten that, at the same time, the sailors on the Great Lakes and in our coastwise-trade are the best paid and fed seamen that ever manned a ship.

The history of every other industry in this country demonstrates that the foreigner cannot carry our trade more cheaply than we can do it ourselves; and the history of shipping itself, where protected, is an unanswerable argument against this contention. These facts demonstrate that the shipping industry, like every other industry, if given the same protection and encouragement, would drive the foreigner from our ports, restore our flag to the sea, and at the same time would reduce freight-rates, widen our markets and increase the wages of labor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Cost.—The cost of carrying out the provisions of this bill will, no doubt, be one of the most fiercely assailed and most grossly exaggerated by the agents of foreign steamship companies, who have had the audacity to oppose any legislation in behalf of American shipping, even in the committee-rooms in the Capitol at Washington. This point also will be the principal one of attack by the free-traders. The Commission has had careful estimates made upon this question; and the net cost to the Treasury, should the bill go into effect in July, 1906, as contemplated, could not exceed for the ten years $40,000,000; and in order to reach this amount every steamship-line contemplated must be established, and at least 1,500,000 tons of new shipping must be added to our foreign fleet.

Purposes of the Bill.—The great purpose of this bill is to give increased markets for the products of the field and factory; to increase American commerce; then to provide and man an auxiliary fleet for our navy, and last, to aid shipping. Will this purpose of the bill be accomplished? It has always been argued that every vessel in a foreign port is an advertiser of home industries, and that the most powerful developer of foreign trade is regular steamship-lines.

Upon this proposition I ask consideration of the following facts:

In 1886, Germany established a steamship-line to the East Indies. In two years, her export trade on these ships was 27,369 tons; in eight years, it had increased to 89,148 tons. So well satisfied was Germany with this East-Indian line that in 1890 she subsidized another line running to East Africa. The receipts of this line increased from 453,000 marks in 1892 to 1,476,000 in 1898. The subventions to both these lines were increased and renewed for fifteen years in 1898.

The tonnage of Japan has increased from 200,000 tons in 1896 to 830,000 tons in 1904. Her commerce has increased from $153,251,000 in 1896 to $342,160,000 in 1904. Her commerce has increased in harmony with the growth of her tonnage.

From San Francisco a line of subsidized ships runs to British-Australasia. The exports on this line have increased from $12,674,000 in 1896 to $27,401,000 in 1904. No line of American steamships runs from the United States to Brazil. Our export trade with that country has decreased from $15,000,000 in 1895 to $10,000,000 in 1903. During the same period, our exports

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Canada increased from $51,000,000 to $161,000,000; and to Mexico from $12,000,000 to $41,000,000. But we have American means of transportation; we own our "delivery wagons" by both land and sea, to these two countries. The time was when there were American business houses in South America, India and China. Then we had ships that sailed to these countries. When the American ship disappeared, the business houses vanished. A few years ago, the export trade of Puget Sound was practically nothing. In 1901, the Boston Steamship Company was established; the exports that year amounted to $20,357,000. Last year it was $50,000,000. Recently the two great Hill vessels have been put on between Seattle and the Orient, and the export trade of Puget Sound for the month of last November was $6,247,783. For the coming year it will certainly reach $75,000,000. This vast increase, that has benefited every interest, is almost wholly due to the expansion of our Oriental markets by these American ships. This expansion especially benefited the farmers of the West, and it has benefited every wheat-raiser in America. Mr. Hill recently stated that he would carry a barrel of flour from St. Paul to Hong-Kong for eighty cents. The great Boston line, established in view of the promises of the Republican party to assist shipping, has always been run at a loss, and is soon to be discontinued, unless assistance comes. Mr. Hill stated in New York city, before the Merchant Marine Commission, that he would never build another ship in America so long as present conditions continued. The Japanese Government now has an option of purchase of the magnificent steamers of the Pacific Mail. Such is the shame of the situation of American shipping on the Pacific Coast—the only place where an unaided attempt is being made to keep our flag on the seas. Most inexcusable and outrageous of all, the Government runs the antiquated transports, an inherited curse of the Spanish War, in competition with these Pacific lines, although it costs the Government twenty-five per cent. more than it would to have the same service performed by private lines. This infamy is perpetrated on American shipping solely that petty government officials and their friends may "junket" over the seas, "deadhead," at Government expense. History demonstrates that as a nation's merchant marine has increased so has her commerce expanded. The experience of all nations demonstrates that trade

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

follows the flag. Wherever our flag has gone our trade has increased. Wherever it has retired, our trade has vanished. In view of these facts, who can doubt the wisdom of the words of the beloved McKinley in his last speech: "One of the needs of the times is direct commercial lines from our vast fields of production to the fields of consumption, that we have but barely touched. Next in advantage to having the thing to sell is to have the convenience to carry it to the buyer. We must encourage our merchant marine. We must have more ships. They must be under the American flag, built and manned and owned by Americans."

The Result.—Neither nations nor individuals can expect anything of value for nothing. This bill will cost something if its provisions are entirely complied with. The maximum amount for the entire period of ten years might reach $40,000,000, as already shown. But the expenditures under the bill will be regulated by the new lines established, and by the new ships that enter the foreign trade. Nothing will be spent until value received has first been given. Should this forty millions be spent, then let us pass from the picture of cost to the picture of results. It will add 1,500,000 tons to our foreign shipping. It will give investment to $700,000,000 of American capital. It will give employment to 500,000 American workmen. It will keep at home more than half a million dollars, in gold, each day now sent to Europe. It will give to American labor $1,000,000 in work;—$1,000,000 in wages each day, that is, now given to those in another land owing allegiance to another flag. It will widen our markets. It will increase our exports. It will reduce our freights. It will increase the price of what we sell. It will decrease the price of what we buy. It will build up our shipyards. It will increase the demand for labor. It will increase the wages of those who work. It will keep at home the stupendous sum of more than two billion of dollars, and give it to our own people. It will benefit all sections, all trades and all classes. It will make us independent of every other nation. It will make our flag more revered at home, more respected abroad. It will give us an auxiliary that will make our navy really great. It will protect us in war, and add to our wealth in peace. It will make the great Republic truly a World-Power—the mightiest nation in all the history of the world!

W. E. HUMPHREY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: ST. PETERSBURG: BERLIN: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *February, 1906.*

WE thought last month we were merely taking part in a General Election. In fact, we were witnessing a vast elemental convulsion. The writer who compared the movements of the polls with "an earthquake in the Himalayas launching down whole hillsides, swinging forests from the root, and burying cities in ruin," scarcely exaggerated. The magnitude of the Liberal and Free-Trade victory, without precedent in the political history of the last seventy years, surprised no one more than the victors themselves. They expected, of course, to win; they did not expect to trample their opponents almost out of existence. Yet this is what they have accomplished. The Unionist members of Parliament, who after the General Election of 1900 numbered 402, have shrunk to a group, so disunited and so bitter in its disunion that it hardly deserves to be called a party, of 157. The Liberals and the Labor representatives, who five and a half years ago were no more than 186, are now 430 strong. The Nationalists have captured one seat more than they held in 1900, and face the new Parliament a compact and disciplined body of 83. The Liberal, Labor and Nationalist majority over the Unionists is 356. The Liberal and Labor majority over the combined forces of the Unionists and the Nationalists, who might on some matters be found acting in unison, is 190. The Liberal majority over all other parties—Labor, Nationalist and Unionist—is 88. Such is the record in figures of one of the most amazing transformations in English politics. But figures are far from telling the whole tale. Only four of the Ministers in the late Cabinet escaped destruction, and of these one only survived because of a split between the Labor men and the Liberals, and another was defeated in his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own constituency and had to reenter Parliament through the back door of a safe seat in Dublin. The rest, with the late Prime Minister at their head, were ignominiously rejected. Seats that were regarded as so irredeemably Conservative that they had not been contested for twenty years were last month attacked and carried. Members who had represented their constituencies for more than a generation found themselves miraculously turned adrift. Social and territorial influences, faithful service, a distinguished career, historic associations availed them nothing. Wales returned not a single Conservative. Scotland was barely less emphatic in its condemnation of the late Government. The English counties and the English boroughs plunged unhesitatingly into the flowing tide. London, which a month ago was represented by 51 Unionists and 11 Liberals, is now represented by 42 Liberals and 20 Unionists. Counting votes and not seats, it appears that a Unionist plurality of about 300,000 has been converted into a Liberal plurality of some 600,000. As one stronghold of Toryism after another was captured, it began to be doubtful whether such a thing as a safe Conservative seat any longer existed. When Mr. Balfour's defeat was made known, two Conservative candidates who felt assured of victory in their own constituencies offered to retire in his favor. Their offers were not accepted, and on the whole it was just as well that they were not, for both candidates were rejected. Birmingham alone stood firm, and no one, I think, grudged Mr. Chamberlain his magnificent success in the city he has served so splendidly, first as Mayor and then as Member of Parliament, for five-and-thirty years. But no one, on the other hand, mistakes the meaning of that success. It was not a political, but a personal, triumph. Knowing Birmingham pretty well, I have no hesitation in saying that it voted far less for Tariff Reform than for Mr. Chamberlain. It has faithfully clung to him through all the somersaults of his political career; I do not doubt that it will continue to cling to him through whatever surprises and changes he may still be capable of. Moreover, although Birmingham itself proved impregnable, the Birmingham area was successfully invaded. In what for the past twenty years has been considered the special sphere of the Chamberlain influence, the Liberals carried no less than twenty-one seats. That is an achievement which considerably discounts Mr. Chamberlain's triumph in Birmingham itself. Birmingham, it is clear, is no longer the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Midlands. Still less is it England. Outside of the city's limits there was no place, from the Isle of Wight to the Shetlands, where the Unionists were able to make any sort of a stand.

Political elections are rarely fought exclusively on a single issue, and last month's campaign was not determined solely by the Free-Trade instincts of Great Britain. The Liberals were greatly helped by the Chinese Labor question, and they made the amplest and in many cases the most unscrupulous use of its assistance. They were also helped by the unmeasured hostility of the Non-conformists towards the Education Act of 1902. In all constituencies where no Labor candidate was running, the Labor vote went to swell the Liberal majority, chiefly because the late Government did nothing to reverse the decisions that made Trades-Unions liable for damages and declared picketing illegal. Again, the Licensing Act passed by Mr. Balfour's Cabinet was regarded by many Englishmen who are far from being Temperance agitators as an unworthy surrender to the brewers. These were tangible allies on the Liberal side, and their influence was considerably increased by the natural "swing of the pendulum," the inevitable discontent that fastens upon any Government that has been long in power, the memory of several grave administrative scandals arising out of the South-African war, and above all by the conviction that Mr. Balfour's failure to make his fiscal policy intelligible to the multitude and his tactics of evasion and subterfuge dishonored both the country and the Parliament. All this, undoubtedly, had its weight. A direct plebiscite on the question of Protection or Free Trade most probably would not have shown such an overwhelming majority in favor of leaving things alone as the Liberals piled up last month. Nevertheless, without in any way minimizing these subsidiary issues, it remains the fact that, taking the country as a whole, they were subsidiary issues and not the predominant ones, and that the fiscal question overtopped all others. I doubt, for instance, whether there was a single convinced Protectionist who voted for the Liberals because of his objection to Chinese Labor or the Education Act. I doubt, again, whether there was a single convinced Free-Trader who voted against the Liberals because he approved of the policy of the late Government in all other matters. On both sides, the final and compelling argument was the opinion the individual voter had formed on the merits of Mr. Chamberlain's and Mr. Balfour's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fiscal policies; and, though heroic efforts are still being made to explain the result away, it cannot seriously be doubted that the country decided, and meant to decide, against Protection in any form. No one is quite so hardy as to deny that, had the Unionists gone into the fight unhampered by the fiscal issue, they would have made a far better showing. They would probably have been defeated in any case, but they would not have been, as they are, snowed under. It made comparatively little difference at the polls whether the candidate was a Chamberlainite or a Balfourite. In either case, he was held to be tarred with the same brush, and the conservatism of the British people would have none of him. After three years of incessant agitation in Parliament, in the press and on the platform, in the course of which every aspect of Protection and Free Trade was meticulously canvassed, it seems to me almost a species of dementia to pretend either that Protection was not the controlling issue of the campaign or that the country did not pronounce emphatically against it.

Nevertheless, there are Unionists who make this pretension. They insist, what is perfectly true, that the turnover in the number of votes cast was nothing like so great as the turnover in Parliamentary representation, that where Free Trade polled a hundred votes Protection polled nearly ninety, that the issue was confused by secondary questions, that an extraordinary conjunction of circumstances such as is never likely to occur again played into the hands of the Free-Traders, that the result of the first clash between Protection and free imports gives ground for hope rather than despondency, and that Unionists have only to persevere in Mr. Chamberlain's footsteps to reach their ultimate goal. That is the view of the "whole-hoggers." They emphasize it by pointing to Mr. Chamberlain's success in Birmingham and to Mr. Balfour's defeat at Manchester. They attribute the disaster which has overtaken them partly to defective organization, but chiefly to Mr. Balfour's ambiguities, half-heartedness and hesitations; and they are fiercely maintaining that the Unionist party has only to be reconstituted on a more democratic and representative basis, has only to get rid of the domination of the "country-house clique," and has only to commit itself to Mr. Chamberlain's programme to be certain of the future. Whether those calculations are ill or well founded, action based upon them can only lead to a second and more disastrous split in the Unionist ranks.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Chamberlain is not cast down and means to commit the Unionist party to his policy and to continue fighting for it as long as he lives. The internal situation in the Unionist ranks is, at present, full of fascinating perplexity. I dare not even attempt to predict its outcome, but I may repeat, without endorsing, the rumor that Mr. Chamberlain may in the end attempt a compromise by dropping his food taxes and striving to rally the party on a ten-per-cent. duty on foreign manufactured goods. Whether such an attempt, if really made, would succeed in its object cannot at present be determined. In any case the chances of reconstituting the party on its old Free-Trade basis seem to be almost infinitely remote. In a greater or less degree it appears inevitable that the Unionist party will emerge from its present confusions pledged to a policy of fiscal change. Whether that programme will not prove a greater millstone round its neck than even Home Rule proved round the neck of Liberalism is an interesting speculation. Mr. Chamberlain looks forward apparently to winning over to his side both the Nationalists and the Labor Party; and I am by no means disposed to lay it down that his anticipations may not ultimately be realized. The Nationalists even now are not on his side only because they are Home-Rulers before they are Protectionists. If Mr. Chamberlain can find the means to satisfy their purely Irish demands, they would not hesitate a moment about forming an alliance with him. The Labor Party he hopes to conciliate by an advanced programme of social reform. Here again it is not certain that he will fail. The problem of finding the money for the measures which the Labor men advocate, without having recourse to indirect taxation, will puzzle Liberals, will puzzle Labor, and may lead to a secession of Labor to the ranks of Protection.

Quite apart from everything else, the General Election of January, 1906, will always be memorable as marking the first emergence in English politics of a definite Labor Party. Fifty-one Labor men have been returned to the House. Twenty-nine of these are pledged to act independently of both Liberals and Conservatives. They will sit on the Opposition benches; they will have their own whips and their own organization; they will vote with an exclusive regard to the interests of their class. That means, for one thing, the beginning or rather the development of the group system in the English House of Commons. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

means, for another, that the working classes are becoming conscious of their political power, are throwing off the domination of caste and social influences, and are determined for the future to be represented in the national legislature by men of their own class. Quite apart from the programme which they will advocate, that is to my mind a singularly auspicious omen. It foreshadows the day when England will be as democratic in fact and spirit as she long has been in her political forms. In these communications I have frequently insisted that the Labor Party is the coming party in English politics. The infusion of these direct, hard-headed, severely practical men, every one of whom has served a long apprenticeship in affairs on municipal councils and on the committees of their trades-unions and benevolent societies, is not a phenomenon to be deplored, still less to be alarmed at. It will make, on the whole, for national efficiency, and for a juster valuation of the really important things in politics and society. On most points, for the present at any rate, the Labor men will be found supporting the Government. The two principal measures of the opening session are assumed to be bills for amending the Education Act and reversing the decision of the House of Lords in the Taff Vale case. These are measures that the Labor men will undoubtedly support. The time, however, will undoubtedly come when official Liberalism will find itself unable to comply with the demands of the Extreme Left. Then will come Mr. Chamberlain's opportunity for driving a wedge into the Government ranks—if he can.

ST. PETERSBURG, *February, 1906.*

A FEW weeks ago, Russia was jubilant and revolutionary; to-day, on the eve of the elections, she is sober and conservative. For it is with nations as with individuals; after the gay carnival comes the black fast; the day of dissipation is followed by a week of the blues. And the vastness of the change that has come over the nation is as striking as its suddenness. In October, the revolutionary spirit was omnipresent and well-nigh irresistible. It cheered the pessimistic, made the phlegmatic enthusiastic and converted some of the most aristocratic to the cause of the democracy. Many a Saul of the revolution became a Paul overnight, while less noteworthy conversions by the hundred were so common that they soon ceased to evoke surprise. It was a veri-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

table harvest-time for psychologists, who could study the soul-states of the crowd, follow their rapid transitions as never before. The cases one came across were truly curious. I remember one man, in particular, who enjoyed a literary reputation in Russia and deserved it. He was also one of those fitfully demonstrative patriots who love their country as Mrs. Micawber loved her husband; and he consequently looked askance at the United States and Great Britain as the real enemies lurking behind Japan. He was a *bourgeois* of the *bourgeois,* when the lightning-flash of the revolution revealed the truth to him and he became a Social Democrat overnight. Thenceforth his zeal knew no bounds, his will brooked no contradiction, his views admitted no doubt. That was in October. . . . A reactionary wave has passed over the land since then, drawing in many scores of thousands. It swept away that literary convert to Socialism from the presence of his comrades, and many others with him.

The capers cut by the officials were especially amusing. Prematurely giving up the Autocracy as lost, large numbers of them made hot haste to turn from what they deemed the setting to the rising sun. They announced that they had always been democrats at heart, had always known that the régime was rotten and would fall to pieces. The Autocracy, on which they had lived and still were living, they proceeded to scourge with tongues that stung like scorpions, until there was not a sound place left in it. "A man's foes shall be those of his own household." Some of these new converts actually supplied the popular party with materials for their indictments of the dynasty; they revealed state secrets, they refused to forward official telegrams. Over them, too, the reactionary wave has since rolled, blotting out impressions that lately seemed deep and abiding, and these men now fulminate against the Government for not employing repressive measures early enough. The revolutionary rabble ought to have been treated with shrapnel. Witté, who failed thus to deal with them, is a traitor. He richly deserves to be impeached and punished or punished and impeached. As for them, they have been true to the Autocracy all along, its real friends in need.

That the revolution should have lost its glamour in the eyes of the struggling classes who have something to lose, needs no explanation. It is human nature. But the attitude of the peasants is less easy to grasp, and a good deal more depends upon their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conduct. If the peasants keep the peace, all is well for a long time. For, in Russia proper, the armed insurrection is virtually suppressed, and the only care of the authorities is lest it should break out in Spring anew in the guise of agrarian disturbances.

The Russian peasant is an enigma, even to his own people. You can seldom tell what he will say or do about any question whatever, unless it refer to his land, to God or the Tsar. And then he thinks and acts like his forefathers two or three hundred years ago. Those are the three essential elements of which time and eternity seem to him composed. He loves the land, and is in most cases ready to "crawl out of his skin" to increase his share of it. He does not always think pillage, arson, and even violence against the person too high a price to pay for a slice of a nobleman's property, especially if others share part of his responsibility for these misdeeds. God and the Tsar are also of the essence of his life, and although many mujiks were attracted by the seductive pictures of a republic which professional revolutionists drew for them, they nearly all insisted that the Tsar should be the acknowledged "Emperor of the commonwealth." Politics, therefore, as such, have no more charm for the average peasant than the higher mathematics, of which he understands no less. Hence, the only way to win him over to the popular movement is by promising him land for nothing, and that is precisely what the revolutionists and several Liberals freely did, and did in the name of God and the Tsar. "The soil," they said, "is God's, not the noblemen's, therefore the Tsar has given it to the peasant. Let them take and till it." And, accordingly, they took it, sacked the manors, in many instances burned them and divided the spoil among themselves. That was the only point of contact between the revolutionists and the peasantry, the one gave freely what belonged to their neighbors, and the others took what was thus given. Then came the day of judgment, when the spoil had to be disgorged, the land vacated, punishment endured; and the last state was recognized as worse than the first. The truth is that both revolutionists and democrats committed a grave mistake in their treatment of the peasants. Aiming at immediate results, they bribed instead of educating them—and, what was still worse, bribed them with the property of other people which the whole State was able and minded to protect.

Here is an instance of how the prophets of the revolution went

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to work: A peaceful little village named Khorino, some four hours' railway journey from St. Petersburg, was thrilled one night by the arrival of thirty-eight strange men and eight strange women. It was hours after every one had gone to bed; and the visitors made straight for the schoolhouse and put up at the schoolmaster's. But they had come for business, and, without a moment's delay, they called a meeting of the peasants, of whom some eighty, including women and children, were brought together. One of the speakers cried: "Sugar really costs seven copecks, but the retailers are charging you seventeen. Isn't that true? The cost price of flour is four roubles, but the dealers make you pay five and a half." And the upshot of his address was to prove that the Duma was a delusion and a snare for the peasants. The proper course for them would be to take revolvers and rifles and begin to pillage the country houses of the landlords. That, the speakers added, could now be done with impunity, because there were no authorities any more. An old peasant objected that the Tsar was still there. "Not at all," they answered. "He too has been removed. We have no need of a Tsar now; he is a needless luxury." Then another of the peasants urged that in any case God would punish them if they broke their oath of allegiance. But the revolutionists took a cigarette, stuck it into the glittering image of St. Nicholas, and asked: "Come now, what do you think? Is that a holy image? Isn't it a mere dry spruce board?"

At this the peasants murmured and left the house, for their religious sentiment was deeply hurt. Next day, the agitators were driven off and compelled to return to their homes. Then another emissary went to the half-station Oksochy, and handed in a telegram addressed to St. Petersburg. The official explained he had orders to accept none but official telegrams, and then the emissary, raising a revolver, shot him dead. Other revolutionists came and showed written orders compelling the peasants to give them their horses from place to place *gratis*. The final verdict of the peasantry in that part of the country was: "The Emperor acknowledges us as citizens, he gives us admittance to the Duma. But the gentry don't wish us to enter, so they send strange people with revolvers against us."

That is only one instance, but it stands for many. The Socialists who preach violence use the promise of free land as a lever,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They do not, of course, mean to fulfil it, for that would be to renounce Socialism; they only intend to rouse the peasantry against society, and they are successful. On the other hand, the parties of order cannot hold out any such seductive prospects, because they believe in the principle of private property. Hence, they are seriously handicapped. The revolutionists can be generous, nay prodigal, with other people's possessions.

Here is an instructive example of how the oracle is worked. In South Russia, there is a county of the province of Poltava known as the Lokhvitsky District. The Revolutionary League occupied it, and at first struck terror to the hearts of the peaceful inhabitants. But they promised to confiscate the estates of the landlords and gentry and distribute them among the peasants, giving nine acres to each—not less than nine acres. And the mujiks, believing, were delighted. Yet the truth is that, in the entire province of which Lokhvitsky is but a mere fraction, all the arable land that exists, if taken and divided among the peasants, would give less than an acre and a half for each. In the Lokhvitsky District, the share would not be even as much.

Anarchy would have been the outcome of this movement if the authorities had not succeeded in checking it. The difficulty lay and still lies in the lack of troops. But, none the less, the peasants have of late been picking up wholesome ideas on the principle and practice of private property. And already they are mistrustful of the speechmaker from the city, who is generally a peace-breaker as well. They are beginning to grasp the fact that the abolition of property is a weapon that might be employed against themselves. They also understand that the transfer of landed property cannot be permanently effected without writing, signing and sealing. Therefore, many of them are now writing to their landlords asking them to sell them lots on reasonable terms, the money to be advanced by the Peasants' Bank in accordance with the imperial ukase recently promulgated. And in the villages there is a growing revulsion of feeling against extreme Liberalism.

Before the armed insurrection broke out, Liberalism of the most uncompromising character was popular everywhere. People were anxious, above all things, to see the old régime abolished, and, believing that violence only could effect it, they secretly or openly held with those who preached and employed force.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Almost everywhere, this moral support was freely accorded, money was subscribed, hospitality extended, information volunteered. *"Ecrasez l'infâme!"* was the watchword of the enemies of the Autocracy, and their name was legion. If at that time the elections had been held, it is probable that a large majority of the elected would have been extreme radicals. The Minister President, it is affirmed by some of those who know him, would also have been a friend of the popular party. That, however, is merely surmise. What is certain is that everything would have been different from what it is and will be. In the days before the armed rising, Liberalism was still a cherished dream from which the nation hoped to awaken to a millennium. There had been as yet no disillusion. Since then it has become a nightmare, the recollection of which gives quiet folk a shudder. The violent action is being followed by a correspondingly violent reaction.

Who is to blame? The Liberals timidly accuse the revolutionists, while the moderates lay the responsibility upon the radicals, who expected to see order emerge from anarchy, prosperity emanate from destruction. But the unbiassed outsider will probably be disposed to look upon the conduct of the Russian people, and of each of its parties, as the national outcome of character, training and mental condition. It is clear that the Slav nation lacks political education and self-control; has no idea of tactics, no habit of discipline, hardly yet a standard by which to separate the secondary from the essential, the final goal from the intermediate aims which differ little from the means. The elements of the population that display an interest in public affairs are animated by a spirit of insubordination which makes it hard for them to combine. They are atoms which would seem to repel rather than attract each other, so that in lieu of a few strong parties a large number of little groups are likely to be formed. Moreover, they are more deeply moved by purely personal considerations than by patriotism, discerning friends and enemies where we should expect them to see only Russia and her destinies. This, too, will doubtless be remedied in time, but it seems premature to expect a change to-day or to-morrow. The fact that certain powerful parties have been called into being, such as the Constitutional Democrats, the Party of Order, the Party of October 30th, hardly weakens the force of my remarks. The members of those bodies hold together most loosely, the bond that links them being often

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agreement on some secondary matter, while they disagree in essentials. The Constitutional Democratic Party, for example, contains republicans and monarchists, men who would nationalize the land and men who would resist nationalization by force if necessary; politicians who are willing to employ the machinery of the Duma for reform, and others who obstinately refuse to accept a Duma or any chamber not invested with the functions of a constituent assembly. And all these mutually repellent elements are for the moment gathered together as chance pedestrians might be assembled under an archway during a violent shower of rain. In a few weeks or months they will probably have split up into a number of little groups.

A majority of advanced Liberals would in all probability have been sent to the first Russian Duma if there had been no insurrection. But now? Events which then seemed surer even than that are now become doubtful. Security for life and property appears a much greater boon to the struggling masses than political rights which most of them are incapable of grasping. I should not be surprised in the least if the nation were to return a majority of moderates resolved to take their stand on the platform of the October Manifesto. That the Government will exert any pressure on the voters is absolutely excluded. It would run counter to the psychology of the people. Moreover, political considerations will play but a slender part in the struggle of the parties. The average Russian man cares extremely little what political programme is represented by this candidate or that. What concerns him infinitely more is that Ivanoff his friend, or Petroff his enemy, wants to be sent to St. Petersburg to help the Tsar to govern the Empire, and his feelings towards the concrete individual whom he loves or hates will shape his vote.

Sadder far than the probable return of a lukewarm majority to the Duma is another result of the violence of the insurgents. The enfranchisement of the Jews may long be delayed in consequence. I sincerely hope I may be unduly pessimistic, but I cannot get rid of the impression made by a long sequel of phenomena which cannot be enumerated here. When the October Manifesto was promulgated, the Jewish question was uppermost in men's minds, and so little doubt was entertained that the secular grievances of that much-suffering people would be shortly redressed that many journalists fancied it was a question of weeks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only, while a few believed a report then circulating that a ukase was being written abolishing the existence of the Ghetto or Jewish Pale of Settlement. Count Witté was known to be in favor of full enfranchisement and equal rights, while the workmen, the intellectuals, and a very large section of the officials concurred in his view. Looking around for support in the country, the Minister President naturally and in the first place relied on the Hebrew elements. If they would not stand by him from sentiment or political conviction, they certainly would from interest. So he hoped, nay thought.

But the Jews were among the first to abandon Witté. They would enfranchise themselves by their own efforts. They were as the swimmer who, feeling that he can freely float and move in the water, discards his cork belt. Had they not materially contributed to win the battle of freedom? They had sacrificed their racial and denominational aims and pooled their interests with those of the Russian revolutionists, swearing to stand or fall with these. It was on that basis that they founded the famous Bund or Revolutionary League, which has produced many of the most fearless, heroic and cruel terrorists in all Russia. The revolutionist leader whose name is a clarion to thousands, the redoubted "Maxim," whose adventures are the theme of a cycle of legends, is a Jew. The Jewish organizations, one of them the Bund, were among the revolutionary societies that summoned the Russian people to withdraw gold from the Savings and State Banks, to refuse payment in paper, and to rise up in arms against the Government of the Tsar. Among the results were the last great strike, the insurrection in Moscow and other cities, the bloodshed which still continues, the financial losses, and, worse than all else, the economic and psychic derangement of the Russian nation.

It was a terrible, an irreparable, mistake! There is a tide in the affairs of people as of individuals which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune, and unless the symptoms were unusually deceptive it came for the Russian Jews on the 30th of October. Not that Witté was their Moses who would work miracles for them. Even if they had rallied round him, he is far too cautious a politician to have endangered success by haste. Measures of relief, partial, indeed, but most welcome, he would have bestowed. A number of them were outlined, some were even drafted; but before they could be enacted as statutes the Jews had thrown in their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lot with the Russian revolutionists, and after that no more was heard about the partial reforms. Two of the least important were, indeed, carried out by the Finance Minister; but then the impulse died out, and the last state of the ill-starred Jews is likewise worse than the first.

If Count Witté and his Cabinet, many urge, were truly Liberal, they ought never to have abandoned the Jewish cause, however dissatisfied they might have been with the attitude of the Jews And that is, undoubtedly, true. If it be ethically wrong, as it certainly is, to treat a cultured people as an inferior race, it is no answer to the charge to plead hostility on the part of their leaders. Two blacks do not yet make a white. But that is not Count Witté's plea. What his few friends advance in his behalf is this: his plan was to grant the Jews a good deal of relief in secondary matters, but not to confer equal rights upon them, because that was beyond his power. The Russian people represented by the Duma is alone competent to strike off their fetters once for all. But it was possible, probable, nay all but certain, that they would have done that if the Russian Liberal movement had been guided by political common sense. If the Jews, whose influence upon that movement was powerful, had held aloof from the armed rising and thus enabled Count Witté to lean upon the Liberals, the Duma would certainly have had a sweeping majority of delegates favorable to the enfranchisement of the Jews.

At present, that is but a melancholy chapter of the depressing records of things that might have been. A heavy wave of reaction had swept over Russia, washed away those Liberal impressions before they could serve as moulds for legislation. Witté's views are immaterial to the issue; for, if Witté were as Liberal as Abraham Lincoln, he would still be almost as powerless as a Sioux chief, unless he had a strong Liberal following, and that was denied him chiefly by the Jews. It was a curious conjuncture: on the one side, a formidable body, almost a whole nation, proclaiming Liberal principles and needing a cautious leader; on the other side, a successful leader looking out for a Liberal party; between them, a little hollow which the prominent leaders deliberately deepened and widened until it became an impassable gulf. The leader and the party never met.

And now there has come a period of meditation. *La Russie se recueille.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BERLIN, *February, 1906.*

SUNDAY, January 21st, the anniversary of the massacre of St. Petersburg, was a notable day in the annals of German Social Democracy. The leaders of the movement had decided to celebrate the occasion by convening meetings throughout the Empire, for the purpose of proclaiming their sympathy with their Russian "comrades," and of formulating the popular demand for the abolition, in favor of manhood suffrage, of the three-class system of election to the State Diets. No sooner was the intention of the Social Democrats made known than it was denounced by the Conservatives as a revolutionary plot. What the Socialists secretly proposed, and the Reactionaries affirmed, was to organize street demonstrations in all the big towns of Germany, and, in particular, to furnish the world with a Berlin sequel of the St. Petersburg tragedy by marching in procession before the Imperial Palace, with the object of extorting the suffrage from the hands of the Emperor-King. The alarm, thus sounded, awakened far-reaching echoes. In Saxony, the Government at once issued a general prohibition against all public meetings announced for January 21st, and in Berlin proclamations were posted at every corner warning the inhabitants that, in case of emergency, the police would be assisted by the military in ruthlessly suppressing all attempts to improvise street demonstrations. The manifest nervousness of the authorities was intensified, at this juncture, by the intelligence of serious rioting in Hamburg, where some fifty thousand workmen had ceased work in order to attend meetings of protest against the enactment of a Bill, designed to deprive them of the right to elect their own representatives in the Legislature of the Republic of Hamburg. At the close of the meetings, sanguinary conflicts had occurred between the police and bodies of Hooligans, who had attempted to invade the precincts of the Municipal Buildings; and in several streets barricades had been erected. The Social Democratic leaders were moved by these disturbances promptly to disavow all participation in them on the part of their followers; and they were in a position to support their denial by pointing to the fact that the mob, in addition to a number of private shops, had devastated a Social Democratic Cooperative Store. As regards the contemplated meetings in Berlin, the leaders did not hesitate to affirm that the intention of organizing demonstrations in the streets had never existed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The tranquillizing assurances of the Socialist chiefs were dismissed with contumely by the reactionaries, who redoubled their exhortations to the Government to enforce "exceptional measures against the dangerous agitation of the revolutionaries." The consequence was that, when Sunday arrived, Berlin was found to be, for all practical purposes, in a state of petty siege. Inside the Imperial Palace, where at noon the Emperor was to preside over the annual *Ordensfest,* or Decoration Festival, several companies of mounted troops were assembled; and in the Imperial liveries, behind the palace, an imposing force of artillery stood in readiness to send its "whiff of grape-shot" coursing through the streets. The barracks of all the regiments garrisoned in and around Berlin were also filled with troops, armed as for a campaign, and awaiting the order which, fifteen years before, the Emperor had foreshadowed in the following memorable words: "It is possible, in view of the present Socialistic machinations, that I may order you to shoot down your own relatives, brothers, nay, your parents—which God forefend—but even then you must obey my commands without a murmur."

The streets were teeming with policemen. All of them carried swords and revolvers, and they were ranged in chain formation at regular intervals across the roads. Near them—a highly significant feature—stood the self-appointed agents of the Social Democratic party, conspicuously adorned with red rosettes, and actively assisting the official guardians of the law in preventing the formation of crowds. This formal recognition on the part of the authorities of the ability of the "Party of Disorder," as it is usually designated, to cooperate, on special occasions, in the task of preserving order is justly regarded by the Social Democrats as one of the most important achievements of the day; for the *début* of their proletarian police was uniformly successful. They did duty at no less than ninety-three Assembly Halls, all of which were packed, and in each locality they preserved perfect order.

A foreigner, accustomed to the liberal institutions of the United States or of Great Britain, could not but admire the spirit of discipline pervading the meetings. The key-note of the orations was a deep-set determination to strive, by constitutional means and through the medium of the existing laws, to obtain increased political liberties, designed eventually to enable the working-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

classes to acquire predominant political power. "The proletariat," observed one orator, "is well aware that it would be hopelessly worsted in open conflict with the military. It does not propose to try conclusions of that character. But the Russian revolution has taught it that it possesses, in the general strike, a far more effective instrument than armed resistance for the defence of its rights and privileges." Beneath the platform from which these words were delivered lay concealed a formidable body of police, prepared to fire on the meeting at the least sign of disturbance. It was a superfluous precaution. The assembly, which had been frequently admonished by its rosetted agents against yielding to provocation in any form, was exultant in the sense of its own disciplined order. With stentorian cheers, it carried a resolution of sympathy with the "comrades" in Russia in their fight against an effete Autocracy; and to that resolution was added a second, denouncing the "monstrous injustice" embodied in the three-class system of election prevailing in Prussia, and demanding, in virile language, the substitution for it of the principle of manhood suffrage. That done, the many thousands who had attended the meeting poured into the streets and passed peacefully through the multitudinous lines of armed police on their way home. Every one of the ninety-three meetings ended thus; and in the provinces the public order was preserved equally intact. Throughout the Empire not a shot was fired nor was a single demonstrator arrested. "Red Sunday," in fact, was come and gone: it lives in history under the mocking sobriquet of "Quiet Sunday."

It must be admitted, however, that the Social Democrats were partly responsible for the excitement which preceded their grand demonstration. For months they had indulged in language of the most exalted description. At Jena, where the Party Congress was held in September, they spent two whole days in discussing the probable attitude of the military when the time should arrive for the proletariat to "go into the streets." Bebel himself proclaimed his conviction that the soldiers would not "shoot down their relatives, their brothers, nay, even their parents," but would make common cause with the "comrades." The army, he exclaimed, is permeated with the spirit of Social Democracy, and when the day of revolution dawns, entire regiments will side with the people in defending their rights. The professed confidence of the great demagogue in the "enlightenment" of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

army was not, however, allowed to pass unchallenged; and several speakers, notably the Trades-Union leaders, emphatically admonished the Congress that, on the first sign of revolution, the German Government, to adopt Mr. Krüger's phrase, would "stagger humanity" even more effectively than the Russian Cossacks had done. The upshot of the debate was that Bebel feigned astonishment at the "sanguinary deductions" made from his remarks, and that the Congress passed a diluted resolution, approving of the general strike as the only effective means of repelling any reactionary attack on the Imperial suffrage, and of wresting the concession of an extended suffrage from the various State Governments. The Jena Congress was followed by the forcible elimination from the councils of the party executive of the so-called "intellectuals," who are in favor of an opportunist policy of cooperation, for immediate purposes, with the Parliamentary representatives of the *bourgeoisie;* and for some months the agitation was fomented by systematic appeals to the passions of the proletariat. Frau Rosa Luxemburg, now one of the most prominent figures in the party, publicly boasted that the general strike in Russia had been largely engineered by the German comrades; and she added that the spirit of revolution was destined to travel from the "demolished Empire of the Tsar" to the western states of Europe, where its ideals would be realized, not with the aid of barricades, which were impotent against modern artillery, but by the enforcement of the principle of the general strike, which would infallibly bring the forces of capitalism to their knees. The reactionaries indulged in language of a not less inflammatory character. Their newspapers bristled with appeals to the Imperial authorities regarding the evils of manhood suffrage, as illustrated in the composition of the Reichstag. To Social Democracy, they argued, manhood suffrage is as the breath of life: abolish it, establish for the Empire a franchise similar in principle to that prevailing in the states of Prussia and Saxony, and the revolutionary movement will be deprived of the possibility of further development.

In fact the extremists in both camps seemed bent on organizing a conflict. Count Posadowsky, the Secretary of the Interior, whose moral courage has on more than one occasion proved to be a most valuable asset of the Government, therefore, deemed the moment appropriate for an appeal to the conscience of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country. He addressed a remarkable homily to the Reichstag on the subject of Social Democracy. After expatiating with great eloquence on the admirable social legislation of the Empire, on the blessings conferred upon the working classes by the State Insurance Laws, on the rapidly growing prosperity of all classes of the community, and on the excellence and incorruptibility of the public services, he asked his hearers to ponder, in a spirit of detachment, upon the possible causes of the existence of a party of three million voters, who were filled with implacable resentment against an order of society from which they derived such unique advantages. Count Posadowsky admitted that the social legislation begun under Bismarck was conceived with the idea of propitiating the working-men, and that it had failed conspicuously in that object. But he warned the legislators of the Empire, some of whom were irritated and others profoundly discouraged by this failure, in the most solemn language, against withdrawing their hands from the plough and abandoning all further attempts to perfect their social laws. They must pursue their task, he said, as a matter of conscience, and not of mere expediency. From these general observations the Imperial Secretary passed on to exhibit in detail some of the causes of Social Democracy. He deplored the policy pursued by the great employers of labor in their persistent refusal to distinguish between the working classes, as such, and the Social Democrats. Attention has been called in these pages on a previous occasion to the blunder of which the German capitalists are guilty in their deliberate neglect to differentiate between the trades-unionist and the Marxian movement: how, instead of exploiting the inherent antagonism between the economic and the political organizations of the working classes, they seemed determined to confuse them and to weld them indissolubly into one, possibly with the design of fighting the trades-unions by imputing to them a revolutionary character. At this fundamental error Count Posadowsky pointed a justly accusing finger. He indicted the propertied classes of the Empire on account of what he described as their moral impotency to overcome an essentially materialistic movement. Social Democracy, he reminded them, was admittedly and professedly materialistic. But the wealthier classes seemed to be no less steeped in materialism: revelling in their newly acquired riches, they too frequently overlooked the necessity of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

making self-sacrifices in the interests of society. Finally, Count Posadowsky turned to the State, and confessed himself unable to acquit it on the charge of contributing to the spread of Social Democracy by its rigid adherence to the traditions of a petti-fogging bureaucracy and police.

It was a bold homily; and it aroused among the conservative sections of the community a storm of indignation against its author. But, since "Red Sunday" earned the nickname of "Quiet Sunday," people are recalling its precepts, and signs are even apparent that Prince von Bülow is approximating to the standpoint of his able and thoughtful lieutenant. Within the last few days he has definitely refused the request of the reactionaries, preferred in the Upper Chamber of the Prussian Diet, for the introduction of special legislation, after the Bismarckian pattern of repression, against the Social Democratic movement. While summoning the parties of the *bourgeoisie,* in necessarily ineffective language, to unite against that movement, he has made a significant concession to the spirit of parliamentary government by proclaiming his willingness to satisfy the demand, so frequently urged by the Reichstag, for the payment of its members. It is, indeed, not impossible that the striking proof of their discipline furnished by the Social Democrats on "Quiet Sunday" may eventually mark a turning-point in the domestic policy of Germany. For it is plain that Russia, which the statesmen of Berlin have in times past worshipped as the bulwark of Autocracy, has nothing more to teach them, unless it be the advisability of directing their eyes westward in search of successful methods of government. Already the retreat from Russian ante-revolutionary ideas has been sounded by the states of South Germany. In the Grand Duchy of Baden, a more liberal franchise has quite recently come into operation; in Bavaria, manhood suffrage is about to be introduced; in Saxony, the Government has announced its determination to revise on modern lines the electoral law, which it enacted three years ago in consonance with the reactionary Prussian model; and the Grand Duchy is now preparing to imitate the example of Baden. In these circumstances, it can, notwithstanding the retrograde step taken by the Republic of Hamburg, be merely a question of time before the Kingdom of Prussia yields to the cry for reform raised by the Social Democrats; for the justice of that cry is admitted by all liberal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minds. More than thirty years ago, Bismarck himself described the Prussian electoral law as the most wretched and inefficient of all systems. Its effect to-day is to exclude from all possibility of Parliamentary representation a party which, under the operation of manhood suffrage, polls three millions of votes in the elections to the Reichstag. Under the three-class system, the Social Democrats are without a single voice in the Prussian Diet, whose legislative functions are practically monopolized by the landed aristocracy. No less a person than the heir to the Bavarian throne, the only German prince who occasionally profits by the precedent set by the Emperor to indulge in the luxury of political oratory, has denounced this state of affairs. The press of South Germany has informed Prince von Bülow that under the sway of liberal laws, it is unnecessary for the parties of the *bourgeoisie* to unite against the Social Democratic movement; that the Social Democrats of South Germany are far less "revolutionary" in their sentiments than those of Prussia; and that the Prussian Autocracy, if it desires to prosper, will do well to sever its moral alliance with the principles of Tsardom and to approximate its legislation to the ideals of Western Europe.

WASHINGTON, *February, 1906.*

THE questions in which the Executive and Legislative departments of our Federal Government are most deeply interested continue to be, as they were last month, the fate of the bill conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to fix rates for railways; the disposition likely to be made of the Philippine Tariff bill; the reception which the Statehood bill may expect in the Senate; the outcome of the attempt to secure the ratification of the Santo Domingo Treaty, and the course which Congress may see fit to pursue with regard to the Panama Canal. Concerning four of these questions, the attitude of the Senate seems already defined. The Hepburn bill, embodying a method of rate-making which was supposed to have the President's approval, has but little, if any, chance of passing the Senate, though the House of Representatives adopted it by a stupendous majority, only seven votes being recorded against it. Even if the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce should report the bill by a majority of one, the large minority which insists upon amending it would prosecute the contest on the floor of the Senate-Chamber, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

probably would succeed in carrying the desired amendment. What such Senators as Mr. Foraker, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Aldrich and their coadjutors are resolved upon is that a railway rate fixed by the Commission, if the railroad affected by it appeals from it, shall not become operative until it has been sustained by the courts. In advocacy of an amendment to that effect, Senator Lodge made a powerful speech; and it is known that some of the soundest lawyers and most effective orators in the Senate will follow him on the same side. All the Democrats will be arrayed in the opposite camp, and so will a certain number of Republicans, including, it appears, three members of the Interstate Commerce Committee. Whether the friends of the bill, however, can muster thirteen Republicans, the number needed to transform the thirty-two Democrats into a majority, is considered very doubtful. Concerning the position now taken by President Roosevelt toward the measure there are conflicting reports, from which the most reasonable conclusion seems to be that he would rather have the bill amended than not passed at all.

The Statehood bill, upon which also the House of Representatives set the stamp of approbation, must be subjected to amendment in the Senate, it is generally believed, if it is to become a law. Senator Foraker is determined to get inserted in the bill, as it came from the House, a provision that the question whether Arizona and New Mexico shall be admitted to the Union as a single State shall be submitted to the inhabitants of those Territories separately. Should a majority in either Territory reply in the negative, the proposed unification will not take place. If we are correctly informed, the bill, thus amended, would not entirely fall to the ground in the event of an adverse vote in Arizona or New Mexico, but those sections which authorize the admission of Oklahoma and Indian Territory into the Union as one State would remain operative. Mr. Foraker's hope of carrying his amendment rests on the assumption that he can control sixteen of his Republican colleagues, and secure in addition almost every Democratic vote. Were he deserted by six, or even five, Democrats his amendment might be defeated. If the outcome of Mr. Foraker's amendment shall be to preserve the Territorial status of Arizona and New Mexico for an indefinite term, no inhabitant of the larger States will grieve, for both of them put together fall signally short of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

population that ought to be exacted for Statehood, and Senator Beveridge is unquestionably right in treating as utterly inadmissible the proposal that they be admitted separately.

Senator Lodge, who has in charge the Philippine Tariff bill, expresses confidence in his ability to secure the adoption of it by the Senate without any material change. Few onlookers are equally optimistic. The spokesmen of our beet-root sugar and cane-sugar interests, and the champions of our native tobacco interest, are much stronger in the Senate than they were in the House, and they are determined not to let the bill become a law in its present form. To the plea that equity requires us to treat the Filipinos as we have treated the Porto-Ricans, and to give the former, as we have given the latter, the boon of free trade with the United States, they answer that equity, like charity, begins at home, and that the Government has no moral right to expose our sugar and home-grown tobacco industries to a ruinous competition. Those who argue thus ought logically to advocate the immediate concession of absolute independence, not only to the Philippines, but also to Porto Rico, for the latter island likewise is a producer of sugar and tobacco. Logic and consistency, however, though, ultimately, they may generate an overwhelming public opinion, are not always omnipotent in a legislative chamber, and it looks as if a majority of the Senators could be prevailed upon to disregard the Porto-Rican precedent, and compel the sugar and tobacco of the Philippines to pay duties amounting to fifty (instead of twenty-five) per cent. of the Dingley rates for some time to come. That is to say, a majority of the Senate will consent, under pressure, to confess that, by the acquisition of the Philippines, we have placed ourselves in a position in which we cannot treat our new subjects justly without wronging our fellow citizens. As, of two duties, we ought to do that which is nearest to our hand, the unavoidable deduction from the premises is that we ought to give up the Philippines. The defeat or mutilation of the Philippine Tariff bill as it came from the House will give the anti-Imperialists an irresistible argument. The conscience of this nation will not stand for the strangulation of the sugar and tobacco industries of the Philippines.

Nobody expects to see the Santo Domingo Treaty reported to the Senate and submitted to a vote until the Republicans are sure of support from enough Democratic Senators to command rati-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fication. As there is a vacancy for Delaware, and as Mr. Burton of Kansas is not expected to vote or to be paired, we may say that there are eighty-eight votes in the Senate. Of these the Republicans have fifty-six and the Democrats thirty-two. If three Democrats would cooperate with the Republicans, the treaty would get fifty-nine votes, or the requisite two-thirds. We here assume, what is not quite certain, that every Republican Senator can be relied upon to uphold Mr. Roosevelt's interposition in Santo Domingo. But for the Democratic caucus, the required *quantum* of assistance from the Democratic side would undoubtedly have been forthcoming. As it is, only Senator Patterson of Colorado and Senator McEnery of Louisiana can, it seems, be relied upon. The speech in which the former defended his refusal to obey the caucus, though unquestionably sound in logic and morals, made no impression on his Democratic colleagues—mainly, doubtless, because he himself very recently voted to make the decision of a caucus binding upon all participants therein. We are told that Secretary Root is trying to make the treaty more acceptable to its Democratic critics, by modifying the clause authorizing the United States to interpose with force for the maintenance of order in Santo Domingo, a clause which underwent considerable alteration at the hands of the late Secretary Hay. As remoulded by Secretary Root, it will simply empower the United States to protect those American citizens who are engaged in the collecting of customs duties. We doubt whether even this careful restriction of our right to intervene will suffice to induce a majority of the Democratic Senators to rescind the caucus resolution. Meanwhile, until it has been submitted to a vote and definitely rejected, the treaty remains inchoate, and the *modus vivendi* continues under which American citizens appointed by the Dominican Executive are performing the function of collectors and distributors of the Dominican customs revenue.

What the Senate will do about the Panama Canal depends, doubtless, upon the general attitude of the Republican majority toward the Roosevelt Administration, which attitude will be affected materially by Mr. Roosevelt's acquiescence in an amendment of the rate-making bill. Should the Republican majority be unfriendly to Mr. Roosevelt, it could make itself exceedingly unpleasant by a drastic investigation of the work of the Canal Commission. The $21,000,000 already appropriated to the Com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mission will have been spent in a few weeks, and a large additional appropriation will be asked for. The American people find it very hard to understand how so huge a sum could have been disbursed, when not even the type of the canal has as yet been fixed upon. It is tolerably certain that, if we had decided to let the canal be constructed by contract, very little if any money would have been laid out by the contractor before he knew what kind of a canal was wanted. We have not yet even arrived at the preliminary decision. It is well known that, some time ago, a majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers recommended a sea-level canal. The Canal Commission, however, has not accepted that recommendation, but has reported to the President in favor of an 85-foot-level lock canal. If Mr. Roosevelt concurs in their opinion, he will submit their report with his approval to Congress. We take for granted that Congress will agree with the Commission in preferring the 85-foot-level lock canal, because it will cost much less than a sea-level waterway, and can be completed much more quickly. It is quite possible, however, that the Senate, if in an unsympathetic mood, may decline to place any more money in the hands of the Canal Commission, and may advise that the waterway be constructed either by Government engineers or by contract. It is probable that no contractor would undertake the task unless he were entirely untrammelled with respect to labor. If he had a free hand, he would employ Chinese. The Federal statute which forbids the importation of Chinese labor into the United States is inapplicable to the canal strip. When we consider how much trouble and odium has been brought upon the War Department by the canal business, we can appreciate the wariness which led Secretary Root to resist the proposed transfer of the management of the canal strip and interoceanic waterway to the Department of State. The widely current suspicions of the wisdom and trustworthiness of the Canal Commission have seriously impaired Judge Taft's popularity, and tend to disqualify him as a candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency. His elimination would leave the course pretty clear for Mr. Root. Mr. Roosevelt himself must be growing impatient at the dilatory movements of the Canal Commission, which he must recognize as the weak spot of his Administration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER.

A JEFFERSONIAN DEMOCRAT

is a well-known writer who by conviction and tradition is what he describes himself, and from the point of view of erudition and wide political knowledge is probably the ablest Jeffersonian Democrat in the country.

PAUL MORTON

was in the service of the Burlington railroad system from 1872 to 1890. Beginning as clerk in the land-office of the Burlington and Missouri Railroad, he became, successively, assistant general freight agent and general passenger agent, and ended as general freight agent of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railway. He was President of the Whitebreast Fuel Company from 1890 to 1896; third Vice-President of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé Railway from 1896 to 1898, and second Vice-President of the same railway from 1898 to 1904, when he was called into the Cabinet by President Roosevelt as Secretary of the Navy. Last year he became President of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

DARWIN P. KINGSLEY

was born at Alburg, Vermont, in 1857, and graduated from the University of Vermont in 1881. He was State auditor of Colorado in 1887-8. Since 1898, he has been Vice-President of the New York Life Insurance Company. In 1884, Mr. Kingsley was a delegate to the Republican National Convention. He is a trustee of the University of Ver-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mont and a director of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad.

A. O. Bacon

graduated from the University of Georgia in 1859, and from the law department of that institution in 1860. He served in the Confederate Army as regimental adjutant and staff-captain, and after the war he took up the practice of law in Macon. He has long been active and influential in the politics of Georgia, his native State. He was a member of several State Democratic Conventions, and presided over the Convention of 1880. He was a delegate to the National Democratic Convention in 1884. For many years he sat in the Georgia House of Representatives, of which he was Speaker in 1873-4 and 1877-81. He was sent to the United States Senate in 1895.

Booker T. Washington,

a distinguished American citizen of African descent, was born near Hale's Ford, Virginia, about 1859. Having graduated from Hampton Institute, Virginia, he taught in that institution until he was elected by the Alabama State authorities, in 1881, to his present position as Principal of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, which he organized and made successful and famous. He has written and spoken much on racial and educational subjects, and he is the author of several books, including "Sowing and Reaping," "Up From Slavery," "Character-building," and "The Story of My Life and Work."

Vernon Lee

is the pen-name of Miss Violet Paget, an English writer and critic who has lived for a number of years in Italy. She has written much on the history of the arts, literature and drama of Italy. Among her published works are "Studies of the Eighteenth Century in Italy," "Belcaro" (essays), "Ottilie," "Euphorion" (essays on Renaissance), "Miss Brown," "Baldwin" (philosophical dialogues), "Juvenilia" (essays), "Althea," and "Renaissance Fancies and Studies." Readers of the Review will recall with pleasure three brilliant papers contributed to its pages by Miss Paget's gifted pen—one on "The Economic Dependence of Women," one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entitled "A Postscript on Ruskin," and one entitled "Nietzsche and 'The Will to Power.'"

EDWARD PORRITT

is a native of Bury in Lancashire, England. For several years he was connected with a number of English papers. In 1884, he came to the United States and joined the staff of the "St. Louis Globe Democrat." Returning to England, he was employed for some time as a parliamentary reporter. He now resides in the United States as correspondent for important British newspapers. He writes besides for a large range of American periodicals. In 1893, he published "The Englishman at Home," an account of English government and institutions. In 1901, he finished "The History of the Unreformed House of Commons," which was published in two volumes by the University Press of Cambridge. Mr. Porritt accompanied the Commission of whose work he tells in his article.

LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX

is an American writer and student of literature, who was educated, mainly, in England, and who has contributed comment and criticism to some of the leading publications of the country.

UPTON SINCLAIR,

a native of Baltimore, was graduated from the College of the City of New York in 1897, and did four years' post-graduate work at Columbia University. He is the author of a number of novels: "King Midas, a Romance," "Prince Hagen, a Phantasy," "The Journal of Arthur Stirling," "Manassas, a Novel of the War," and "The Jungle." The last-named work, just published, deals with life in Chicago's Packingtown, narrating the adventures of a family of Lithuanian emigrants who came to America in search of fortune, and showing the conditions which turn the hero into a criminal and a tramp. Mr. Sinclair is Vice-President of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society.

IDA HUSTED HARPER

is an Indiana woman of New England parentage. She studied at the University of Indiana and, later, took almost an entire course at Leland Stanford University. For several

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years she was one of the editors of the Indianapolis *News*, and for a number of years she edited a department in the New York *Sun*. Mrs. Harper prepared a State monograph for the Columbian Exposition, and read papers before several of the Congresses. In 1899, she was sent to the International Council of Women in London as speaker on "The Women Journalists of the United States" and was elected Chairman of the International Press Committee. She was a delegate to the International Council of Women which met in Berlin in June, 1904. Of late years, Mrs. Harper was intimately associated with Miss Anthony in the work of promoting the interests of women. She is author of the "Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony," and, jointly with Miss Anthony, of "The History of Woman Suffrage to the Close of the Century."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED